



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Hw 3MVL F

P 161.7

Harvard College Library



FROM THE LIBRARY OF
FRANKLIN HAVEN
OF BOSTON
AND OF
FRANKLIN HAVEN, JR.
(Class of 1857)

GIFT OF
MARY E. HAVEN
July 2, 1914

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
OR
CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
JULY, 1886 : OCTOBER, 1886.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CLXIV.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO., LONDON.

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1886.

P 161.7

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
GIFT OF
MARY E. HAVEN
JULY 2, 1914.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

CONTENTS OF No. 335.

	Page
ART. I.—1. On the Conditions and Prospects of Trade. Address delivered by the Right Hon. G. J. Goschen, M.P., to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, June 23, 1885.	
2. On the Prices of some Commodities during the Decade 1874–83. By L. Hansard, Esq., F.S.S. Address delivered before the Institute of Bankers, London, December 17, 1884.	
3. History of Prices since the year 1850. By M. G. Mulhall, F.S.S. &c. London: 1885, ...	1
II.—The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley. Edited by H. Buxton Forman. 4 vols. London: 1880, ...	42
III.—1. Through the British Empire. By Baron von Hübner, formerly Austrian Ambassador in Paris and Rome. 2 vols. London: 1886.	
2. The Western Pacific and New Guinea. By Hugh Hastings Romilly. London: 1886, ...	73
IV.—The Apostolic Fathers: S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp. Revised Texts, with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations, and Translations. By J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Bishop of Durham. London: 1885, ...	100
V.—1. Needlework as Art. By Lady Marian Alford. London: 1886.	
2. Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten, oder praktische Aesthetik. Von Professor Dr. Gottfried Semper. Zweite Auflage. München: 1878.	
3. La Tapisserie dans l'Antiquité. Par Louis de Ronchaud. Paris: 1884.	
4. A Short History of Tapestry from the earliest Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century. By Eugène Müntz. Translated by Miss Louisa J. Davis. London: 1885, ...	137
VI.—1. Les Mille et Une Nuits. Contes Arabes, traduits par A. Galland. 1704.	
2. Les Mille et Une Nuits. Contes Arabes, traduits par A. Galland et continués par Caussin de Perceval. 9 vols. Paris: 1806.	

	Page
3. The Arabian Nights Entertainments. With an introduction by Jonathan Scott, LL.D. 1811. Reprint, 1883, ...	166
[And other Works.]	
VII.—Correspondance du Maréchal Davout, Prince d'Eckmühl, ses Commandements, son Ministère, 1801–1815. Avec Introduction et Notes par Ch. de Mazade, de l'Académie Française. 4 tom. 8vo. Paris: 1885, . . .	199
VIII.—Geology, Chemical, Physical, and Stratigraphical. By Joseph Prestwich, M.A., F.R.S., F.G.S., Professor of Geology in the University of Oxford. 8vo. London: 1886, ...	219
IX.—1. Prospectus of the Association for Promoting a Teaching University for London, 1886; and Speeches of Lord Reay, Sir James Paget, Lord Justice Bowen, Lord Justice Fry, Sir Joseph Lister, and others, Members of the Association.	
2. Higher Schools and Universities in Germany. By Matthew Arnold. Second edition. London: 1882.	
3. The German Universities for the last Fifty Years. By Dr. T. Conrad. Translated by John Hutchison, with a preface by James Bryce, M.P. Glasgow: 1885.	
4. La Question du Latin. Par M. Raoul Frary. Paris: 1885, ...	241
X.—1. Œuvres Choiesies de A. J. Letronne. Edites par E. Fagnan. Vol. ii. Paris: 1881.	
2. Modern Egypt and Thebes, By Sir Gardner Wilkinson. 2 vols. London: 1843.	
3. Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum. Edidit Aug. Boeckh. Vol. iii. Berlin: 1853.	
4. Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Edidit Theod. Mommsen. Vol. iii. pars 1. Berlin: 1863, . . .	263
XI.—1. Address of the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone to the Electors of Midlothian. June 14, 1886.	
2. Address of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain to the Electors of West Birmingham. June 12, 1886.	
3. Address of the Marquis of Hartington to the Electors of Rossendale. June 17, 1886.	
4. Speech of the Right Hon. John Bright at Birmingham. Delivered on July 1, ...	284

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
JULY, 1886.

No. CCCXXXV.

- ART. I.—1. *On the Conditions and Prospects of Trade.*
Address delivered by the Right Hon. G. J. GOSCHEN, M.P.,
to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, June 23,
1885.
2. *On the Prices of some Commodities during the Decade*
1874–83. By L. HANSARD, Esq., F.S.S. Address delivered
before the Institute of Bankers, London, December 17,
1884.
3. *History of Prices since the year 1850.* By M. G. MULHALL,
F.S.S., &c. London: 1885.

WITHIN the last half-century—we may say, within forty years—commerce in all its branches and dependent trades has undergone a series of remarkable changes through improvements in the means of conveyance. Locomotion, alike personal and of merchandise, has wholly altered its character during the present generation, and the new powers it has acquired are incomparably superior to those of the earlier times. As regards both conveyance and communication, the civilised world now works by or through appliances of a rare perfection, and some of them of a marvellous character; and the result is an extraordinary increase of human power and enlargement of the sphere of human action. We can travel round the world as easily as our grandsires could reach the south of France; and we can make our words and wishes known across the globe at its widest, and even our individual voices can be heard and recognised at a distance of several miles, by means of a power as invisible as it still remains mysterious. Each and all of these new and powerful agencies have been promptly utilised by commerce—

for which service, indeed, they were chiefly designed; and the happy effects of their commercial operation are to be seen in the remarkable extension of trade and production which had its beginning at the middle of the present century. Moreover, these effects of improved conveyance and communication have much to do with the present depression of prices, just as previously they tended to check the depreciation of the precious metals. These influences, therefore, are obviously of no small importance at the present time, and their operation will be duly considered in the sequel, in connexion with the position and prospects alike of our commercial and of our monetary affairs.

In our own country—which took the lead of the world in this matter—the first epoch of improvement in the means of conveyance was marked by the ‘Canal Mania’ of the last century, now wellnigh forgotten, but which rendered, and in its effects still renders, great service by cheapening the conveyance of heavy and bulky goods. Nor let us forget how early the great modern work of cutting through isthmuses and connecting adjoining seas by navigable canals was begun in Scotland—by the Caledonian Canal; by the Forth and Clyde Canal, uniting the German Ocean with the Atlantic; and in later times by the Crinan Canal, so familiar to tourists. But it is with the fifth decade of the present century that the great revolution in locomotive agencies fairly began. During the previous twenty years (1820–40), the powers of the steam engine had been proved applicable alike to ships and to railways, to the work of traction or propulsion both by sea and land. So early as 1802 Symington’s steamboat was successfully employed on the Forth and Clyde Canal; a steam-packet first plied for hire on the Thames in 1814; and the steam engine was first employed for traction on tramways on the short mineral line now known as the Stockton and Darlington Railway.

Of these two greatest of the new agencies of locomotion, steam navigation at first took the lead. In the year 1819 the ‘Savannah,’ an American sailing ship fitted with steam enginery, crossed the Atlantic, arriving at Liverpool after a voyage of twenty-three days, during sixteen of which she was propelled by steam. So strange was her appearance in those days that when first seen off the Irish coast, at Cape Clear, the ‘Savannah’ was mistaken for a ship on fire; and the admiral in command of the British squadron lying in Queens-town harbour sent out a vessel to her relief. But it was not until nearly twenty years later that the scepticism of scientific

theorists was terminated by a vessel crossing the Atlantic under steam power only. This was accomplished for the first time in April 1838, by the English steamship 'Sirius,' whereby the voyage was shortened by fully one half of its previous average duration. By this time lines of steamships had been established between London and Edinburgh, and elsewhere along our own coasts. As frequently happens in such cases, this new kind of locomotion was regarded in some quarters with considerable prejudice, and to a lively fancy its possibilities of danger were readily obvious. When Charles Dickens made his first visit to America in 1842—in the 'Britannia,' carrying eighty-six passengers, and which made the voyage from Liverpool to Boston in seventeen days—he was by no means satisfied with the venture. Writing to his friend Forster in London, Dickens declares his intention 'to return in a packet ship, *not in a steamer!*' And he adds—

'Were I to tell you all that I observed in our voyage out on board the "Britannia," you would not wonder at my determination never to trust myself on the wide ocean in a steamer again. Consider, for instance, two of the dangers. First, that if the funnel were to be blown overboard the vessel must instantly be on fire from stem to stern—to comprehend which you have only to understand that the funnel is more than forty feet high, and that at night you see the solid fire two or three feet above its top. Secondly, each of these boats consumes, between London and Halifax, seven hundred tons of coal; and it is pretty clear, from this enormous difference of weight in a ship of only twelve hundred tons burden, that she must either be too heavy when she comes out of port or too light when she goes in. Add to all this that by day and by night she is full of fire and of people, that she has no boats, and that the struggling of that enormous machinery in a heavy sea seems as though it would rend her in fragments.'

The beginning of railways may be dated from the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, September 15, 1830, a ceremony which was attended by many political and scientific celebrities, and which was saddened by the fatal accident which befell Mr. Huskisson, one of the most eminent statesmen of the time. But a full dozen years had to elapse ere this new locomotive agency seized upon the mind and imagination of the public. The years 1842-46 were a peculiar period in very various aspects. It was an epoch of intellectual ferment, in which new ideas and sentiments were combined, or arose in conjunction, with an enthusiasm of hopefulness born of a sudden return of prosperity after a long 'winter of discontent.' The fervour was felt in religion and in art, as well as in the domain of practical science. The 'Oxford movement' and the 'Tracts

'for the Times' in England had their counterpart in the Free Church and 'Headship of Christ' movement in Presbyterian Scotland—an idealising and illusive fervour which arose in antagonism to the moderatism or somnolence in religious matters which had long been prevalent. In fine art there was an analogous awakening or revival, which by and by produced the pre-Raphaelite school of painting; and in the sterner domain of politics, the Chartism of the masses and the growing antagonism of the lower to the middle and upper classes, bred of the general suffering of the time, was begetting a reaction against the too rigid application of the political economy which had recently become the creed and foundation of our industrial system—a reaction which showed itself weakly, yet with generous spirit, in the short-lived 'young England' party, and in some of Mr. Disraeli's novels. It was amidst this general fervour that engineering science notably began its long series of triumphs. And the first two great achievements of this kind made a profound impression upon the popular mind, and aroused a contagious enthusiasm. The Thames Tunnel and the building of the 'Great Eastern' steamship were the talk of the time. In neither case did the usefulness and profit of these works correspond with the engineering genius of which they were an outcome. Both the tunnel and the gigantic iron steamship were, in the ordinary acceptance of words, great failures. But they were eminently fitted to touch the popular imagination. That so gigantic a vessel could be constructed entirely—and, so far as floatage was concerned, most successfully—of iron, was at that time a marvel; and the 'Great Eastern' proved singularly effective as an inaugural force to the subsequent revolution in shipbuilding, whereby iron has so largely supplanted wood, with an important increase in the speed and economy of navigation.

The rapid outburst and remarkable developement of engineering science which then occurred, and which has since rendered incalculable service to trade and to the general condition of civilised mankind, was largely promoted, and doubtless was in some degree originated, by a sudden and happy change in the national fortunes which synchronised with, yet which was wholly independent of, the accession to office of Sir R. Peel, and to which his memorable administration at the outset owed its popularity. The five bad harvest years which began with 1837 came to an end with the fine season of 1842—the 'long, long summer' of which year (only equalled since then by 1868) still lives in the memory

of sexagenarians like some bright dream of youth! Under a succession of fine harvests our islands (for the last time) became virtually self-supporting,—the imports of wheat in the year 1845 amounting in value to only 313,000*l.*, proportionately lessening the export of the precious metals in payment. Still more important was the change in the production and supply of the precious metals. The yield of the Russian gold mines, especially, which amounted to 900,000*l.* in 1837, had increased to twice that sum in 1842, and became quadrupled in 1846, when it amounted to 3,410,000*l.*; the Mexican and South American mines also at this time appear to have become somewhat more productive, owing to the re-establishment of settled government; while under the treaty of Nanking in 1841 twenty-one million dollars in silver became payable to our Government by China, in three annual instalments. Under this fortunate inflow of specie the bullion in the Bank of England rose to double its average amount in the ten previous years. In September, 1844, the Bank's stock of coin and bullion amounted to 15,210,000*l.*, and in August, 1846, to 16,360,000*l.*; averaging during these two years 16,000,000*l.*; while the Bank rate for the first time was reduced to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in September, 1844, and thereafter stood on the average at 3 per cent. until January 14, 1847. And this increase in the Bank's reserve was purely due to an augmented supply of gold, not to any decrease in the demand for loanable capital; for simultaneously the commercial paper under discount at the Bank nearly doubled, rising from $7\frac{1}{4}$ millions in the autumn of 1844 to $13\frac{1}{4}$ millions in 1845.

Such were the circumstances under which our Railway Mania took place. During the previous ten years, bills for the construction of railway lines had been submitted to Parliament in augmenting numbers, rising from fourteen in 1834 to forty-two in 1837. Railway making had also been begun on the Continent, and in Germany and Austria fifteen lines were in existence in 1844, including a continuous railway route from Hamburg to Trieste. Not unnaturally, the general fervour and spirit of industrial enterprise in England rushed impetuously into this new channel. In the three years 1845–7, railway Acts were passed authorising an expenditure of 230 millions sterling, and before 1850 no less than 1,100 Acts were passed for the construction of new lines or for the extension of old ones. This memorable mania inflicted severe and widespread suffering upon the shareholders in the new companies, many of whom found them-

selves unable to meet the large monetary liabilities which they had contracted, and all of whom experienced a prolonged lock-up of their capital in a temporarily unprofitable form. Further, a considerable portion of the capital thus invested was wholly lost through jobbery and wasteful expenditure, not unnatural to a period of novel enterprise conducted in a spirit of fervid speculation. Nevertheless the general outcome was highly beneficial, and our people, at a single bound, found themselves equipped with the new agencies of conveyance, both by land and sea, and far ahead of the rest of the world in those auxiliaries of trade and production, at the very moment when the discovery of the gold mines in California and Australia was about to revolutionise the migratory habits and commercial condition of mankind.

Of the powerful aid which railways give to trade and production we shall speak in due course, but with respect to their happy influence upon the social habits and general condition of the people we may here quote the excellent contemporaneous remarks of Miss Martineau:—

‘Railways were to run not only along the margin of the southern part of the island and round the margin of the misty Scottish mountains, but through the vale in which Furness Abbey had hitherto stood shrouded, and among old cathedrals, of which the traveller might see half-a-dozen in a day. It was on Easter Monday, 1844, that excursion trips with return tickets were first heard of. Here began the benefits of cheap pleasure trips to the hard workers of the nation. The process had begun from which incalculable benefits were to accrue to the mind, morals, and manners of the people. From this time the exclusive class was to meet the humbler classes face to face. The peer, and the manufacturer, and the farmer were henceforth to meet and talk in the railway carriage, and have a chance of understanding each other. The proud were to part with some of their prejudice, and the ignorant with some of their ignorance; and other walls of partition than park enclosures were to be thrown down. The operative was to see new sights hitherto quite out of his reach—the ocean, the mountain, the lake, and old ruins and new inventions; and the London artisan was ere long to live within sight of trees and green fields, and yet go to his work every day. As unwholesome streets in London were pulled down, hamlets were to arise at a little distance in the country, from which the humbler classes could go and return to their daily labour in the centre of the town. The diet of millions was to be improved, fish and foreign fruits being conveyed from the town into the country, and milk, butter, and vegetables, fresh from the country, into the towns. Everybody’s wants were to become known by the general communication about to be established, and the supply was to meet the want and the wish. The change was vast, the prospect magnificent; but this change, like every other, had to pass at its outset through a wilderness of difficulties.’

Next, in this consideration of the effects of improved conveyance upon modern trade, we come to the opening of the overland route to India and the East, in which both railways and steam navigation played an important part. Only a few months ago the City of London engaged in paying a well-deserved tribute to the memory of Thomas Waghorn, the youthful enthusiast who was the pioneer in this memorable work. It was the commencement of that return of commerce into its oldest channels which is still in progress, and which is a curious and highly interesting feature of the present times. Apart from the camel caravans which appear to have passed to and from the Indus across Syria to the Levant, there were two main routes of the Eastern trade: one, by sea from India to the Persian Gulf, and thence from Babylon overland to the Levant; the other sea line went to the ports on the Red Sea, and thence through Egypt. Both of these routes became closed to Europe by the rise of the Arabian power and the fierce hostility between Christian and Mohammedan; and thereupon a circuitous route was pursued, under great difficulties, from the Indus over the Hindoo Koosh, thence down the Oxus to the Caspian Sea, thence up the Volga and across by a 'portage' to the Don, and down that river into the Black Sea, and thence to Constantinople. The descent of the Turks into south-western Asia, and finally the capture of the Roman capital by the Ottomans, closed this route also; and for a short interval the old trade with the East—the oldest in the world—came wholly to an end, until it was revived by the maritime discoveries of the Portuguese and the circumnavigation of the southern extremity of Africa. Thereafter almost the whole trade with India and the East was conducted by sea round the Cape of Good Hope, and necessarily fell into the hands of the maritime powers, the Portuguese and Dutch, and ere long into those of England.

A lieutenant first in our own navy and afterwards in the marine of the East India Company, Waghorn became deeply impressed by the importance, and also by the practicability, of greatly shortening the voyage between England and her great Indian dominion; and being well acquainted with both sides of the Isthmus of Suez, he resolved to open a route for travellers to and from India through Egypt. He ascertained the baselessness of the prevailing belief that the difference in level between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea was so great that any canalisation of the isthmus would only produce a cataract or series of rapids, instead of a

navigable waterway. Canalisation was beyond his design, as it was beyond his or any man's powers at that day; yet M. de Lesseps has acknowledged that it was Waghorn's scheme which turned his own thoughts to the future canal, and it was the successful establishment of the 'overland route' which rendered financially practicable the grand subsequent enterprise of the illustrious Frenchman.

Singlehanded, Waghorn in 1830 set to work to establish an overland route to India through Egypt to Suez, *via* Alexandria and Cairo. Partly at his own expense, and also aided to some extent by the Bombay Steam Committee, he erected caravanserais at each of the eight halting-stages in the desert between Cairo and Suez, and provided carriages for the journey, at the same time placing small steamers on the Nile and on the canal of Alexandria. In 1840 the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company took the contract for carrying the Indian mail, thereby establishing the new route. For a time Waghorn himself carried the mails, and on October 31, 1845—fifteen years after the initiation of his project—he triumphantly bore into London the Bombay mail only thirty days old: a vast improvement upon the four months' voyage round the Cape. In 1852 a railway was constructed from Alexandria to Cairo; and in 1857 a connecting line was laid from Cairo to Suez—afterwards abandoned for a longer but better track which runs along the fresh-water canal from the Nile to Ismaila—apparently on the very line of the old canal of Rameses the Great, whereby the navy of the Pharaohs was enabled to operate alike in the Mediterranean and in the Indian seas.

Contemporaneously with the completion of a railway route through Egypt from Alexandria to Suez, there began the grand system of Government Railways in India. Hardly had the Great Trunk Road—England's imperial highway—been completed from Calcutta to Attock on the Indus, when the iron road began to follow in its track; and the opening of the first section of the East India railway, between Calcutta and Raneegunj, in 1857, came just in time to quicken the advance of Neill and Havelock upon Allahabad and Cawnpore at the outset of the mutiny of the Sepoy army. In the Madras and Bombay Presidencies similar works were commenced; and by and by a line was constructed through Central India from Jubbulpore to Bombay, connecting by railway the great western seaport of India with the seat of Imperial Government on the Hoogly. The whole country became traversed by a network of railways, serviceable to

the military power and political influence of the Government, and opening a new era of prosperity to the traders and the cultivating millions of our Eastern empire, and hardly less so to the mercantile and manufacturing classes of our own islands.

We now come to the latest or most recent stage of this rapid progress in the development of the means of travel and conveyance. Canalisation on a grand scale—the uniting of seas and oceans by navigable canals—had been ‘in the air’ ever since the middle of the century. The canalisation of the Isthmus of Darien was a favoured project in the mind of Napoleon III., and the discovery of the rich gold fields of California gave a great impulse in that direction; but the result of the surveys then made at various points across the American isthmus presented greater engineering difficulties than the financial world was at that time willing to encounter, and the energies of France, directed by the indomitable genius of Lesseps, turned to the more hopeful project of canalising the great Isthmus of the Old World. But American enterprise quickly constructed the Panama railway, the opening of which, in 1855, terminated the state of isolation which had previously existed between California and the other States of the American Union. The subsequent civil war in the United States, and the apprehension that California might fall away from the Union, and perhaps unite her fortunes to those of the adjoining British provinces on the Pacific, hastened the construction of the Central Pacific railway, which, traversing the western prairies and the desert of Utah, and also piercing or surmounting both the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevada, completed a continuous railway route from New York to San Francisco, making the ‘Golden Gate’ the western outlet of the North American continent, and placing San Francisco upon one of the great highways of trade and travel around the world. Within the past year the Canadian Dominion, with far inferior resources, has completed a similar enterprise and a still longer line of railway, extending from the open Atlantic at Portland to the Pacific Ocean at Vancouver’s Island.

Meanwhile M. de Lesseps had accomplished the great enterprise of canalising the Isthmus of Suez, and the extraordinary commercial and financial success which quickly attended that costly work prepared the world for further enterprises of an analogous character. Opened in 1870, when 486 vessels (steamers) passed through, the gross tonnage in the first whole year (1871) amounted to 761,467; and

in the very next year it doubled, the tonnage for 1872 being 1,439,169. In 1875 the tonnage had again doubled, being 2,940,708; and in 1881 it had doubled again, being 5,794,401; and last year the number of ships had risen to 3,220—an increase of nearly sevenfold, while the tonnage had increased twelvefold during these fourteen years; and of the present net tonnage yearly passing through the canal 58 per cent. is British. The working expenses constitute only one-tenth of the total receipts, and the 20*l.* stock of the company used to sell at 105*l.*, although at present the price stands at barely 84*l.*, owing partly to the very heavy outlay now in progress for doubling the canal, but partly also to the rise in the value of money, or the fall in all values measured by or expressed in gold. Nevertheless the dividend just announced by the Directors for the past twelve months is equal to 16 per cent. As a general result of this great shortening of the route, the annual trade between the East and the West since the opening of the canal is stated to have increased by forty millions sterling, or fully 30 per cent.

While M. de Lesseps is now devoting himself with ardour to the still vaster enterprise of canalising the Isthmus of the New World, when the Germans have ordered the construction of a canal between the Baltic and the North Sea, and when the Canal of Corinth will soon convert the Morea into an island, greatly shortening the navigation between Italy and the coasts of the *Ægean* Sea, the combined powers of engineering and finance have been successfully engaged in the kindred work of tunnelling the mountain chains of Europe, which of old were the great barriers of nations against hostile invasion, but which are now regarded chiefly as obstructions to trade and traffic. Here, again, we behold the curious spectacle of trade returning into its oldest routes or channels. The Mont Cenis tunnel, by uniting the French and Italian railway systems, has served to reopen the old Roman route to the East by Brindisi; and English officers and merchants bound for India or Australia now embark from Europe by the same seaport from which Lucullus, Pompey, and Cæsar sailed in their galleys to their memorable careers of victory in Anatolia, Syria, and Egypt—the fruits of which first made Rome rich and luxurious through the golden spoils of the East. The St. Gothard tunnel, through another part of the Alpine chain, has opened a direct and swift route between Germany and Italy, reviving in improved form the old trade route between the

German Ocean and the Mediterranean, which once enriched Nuremberg and other German cities in mediæval times, before the Thirty Years' War wrought havoc and desolation upon that region, and drove commerce into other channels. The Arlberg tunnel, in a lesser degree, works towards the same end; and Venice, of old the Queen of the Adriatic, bids fair to flourish anew as one of the chief emporiums, alike as an outlet and as an inlet, of the now restored overland route between Europe and the East. Nevertheless, just as the City of the Doges only rose to commercial sovereignty after and in consequence of the Ottoman conquest of Byzantium, is not Venice Revived destined to be supplanted in turn by the new railway route which is to have its eastern terminus at Salonica?—the vast geographical importance of which place already concentrates upon it the hostile rivalry of two of the greatest military Powers of the continent, each longing to seize it from its present possessor. Or, finally, will not Constantinople itself acquire a new and perilous value when a railway is carried through Asia Minor to the Persian Gulf, and the commercial glories of Byzantium are re-established along with the still more ancient ones of Babylon itself?

At home we have been working on the same line. We have seen the completion of the Severn and the Mersey tunnels, connecting railway systems, and cheapening conveyance, not only by shorter routes, but also by avoiding a break of journey and the expense of shifting the goods from one set of trucks to another. The Liverpool and Manchester Ship Canal is another project of this kind, supplanting or assisting the railway by the cheaper agency of water carriage. It will also mitigate, although it cannot remove, the disadvantage of Manchester as a manufacturing seat or commercial emporium which happens to be situated inland. Birmingham is bestirring itself with a similar motive. A project is on foot to make the capital of the Midland counties a shipping port of the Bristol Channel by means of a navigable waterway, to be formed out of the existing Birmingham and Gloucester canal; and it is possible that coasting vessels will load and unload alongside the Birmingham quays before the more ambitious scheme of the Cotton Metropolis has surmounted its initial difficulties. In truth, every seat of industry connected with foreign trade (as almost all our great industries are) desires to establish itself on the sea coast, where its products can be exported and its raw materials received directly by or from that system of

water traffic or navigation which still remains the cheapest for the average kinds of merchandise, and for which the ocean opens highways to all quarters of the globe. Indeed, wide and full as is the tidal river which connects London with the open sea, it is doubtful whether, in these times of keenest competition, our merchants will not find it necessary either to shorten and improve the lower course of the Thames, or else to erect a commercial emporium at the mouth of the river—of which, perhaps, we see a beginning in the recently opened Tilbury docks, and in the example set by the Peninsular and Oriental Company in transferring their place of embarkation for passengers from the port of London to the margin of the open sea.

We must mention one more—and the newest—of the agencies of communication and exchange, which has proved an auxiliary of commerce in its rapid progress since the middle of the century. The electric telegraph was first demonstrated as a practical success at Hammersmith in 1808, by Mr. Ronalds, contemporaneously with Symington and Fulton's first trials with steamships; but it was not until between the years 1837 and 1845 that Wheatstone in this country, and Morse in the United States, substantially completed the invention—just in time for the new railways, by which the invention was at once adopted, and along whose far-reaching lines it found a ready and cheap field for extension. The capture of the murderer Tawell in 1845, by means of this lightning flash of communication along the Great Western Railway from Slough to London, was the first notable achievement of the electric telegraph, which has since then proved its usefulness in almost every sphere of public and domestic life, as well as in trade, and in that final and completing operation of exchange which is effected by money.

Now let us observe the remarkable extent to which these new agencies of conveyance and communication have been developed since the middle of the century. First, as to shipping, or open sea navigation. Here we find a rapid increase of steamships, built chiefly of iron, each of which, owing to its superiority in continuous speed, can in long voyages do the work of three sailing vessels of the same tonnage; and in short voyages, as between Dublin and Liverpool, Hull and Hamburg, a steamer on the average makes eight trips while an equal-sized sailing vessel makes one. Taking short and long voyages together, the superiority in carrying power (owing to their speed) is reckoned

in favour of steamships as five to one. From Mr. Mulhall's statistics we quote the following figures, showing the growth of the world's shipping (exclusive of ships employed in inland navigation) since the middle of the century:—

Nominal tonnage.			Tons carried by	
	Steamers.	Sailing ships.	Steamers.	Sailing ships.
1850. .	392,000	6,513,000	5,850,000	19,230,000
1883. .	7,330,000	14,310,000	109,450,000	42,630,000

Here we see that steamers, which in 1850 formed less than 6 per cent. of the nominal registered shipping tonnage of the world, now form fully one-third of the whole; while the actual tonnage or weight carried by steamers, which in 1850 was $23\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the whole, in 1883 had risen to 72 per cent. In addition to the greater economy effected by superior speed, which renders a steamer's carrying power in the course of a year from three times to five times that of a sailing vessel of the same size or registered tonnage, two further economies have been introduced: (1) by increasing the size of ships, whereby relatively to their tonnage they can be navigated by fewer hands; and (2) by building ships on lines of less buoyancy, but more adapted for speed—sharper and longer—which can now be done without risk owing to the steady propelling power of steam, together with the employment of iron in the building of the vessels. As shown by the records of the Suez Canal Company, the tonnage of the ships passing through the canal has doubled during the last fifteen years, having increased from 905 tons per ship in 1870 to 2,150 tons in 1881-3, and, more or less, this increase in the size of seagoing vessels is general throughout the world. In consequence of these improvements in speed (equivalent to carrying power) and in the economical working of vessels, we find (1) that human labour applied to navigation has all but quadrupled in efficiency or working power; so that, according to Mulhall, whereas on board of British ships in 1850 one seaman was needed per 101 tons of sea-borne goods, one seaman now suffices for each 388 tons of goods carried, effecting a great (although not an equal) saving in wages, and consequently in freights or the charges for ship conveyance. And, partly owing to this reduced cost of maritime conveyance, the weight of goods carried by ship has increased to sixfold what it was in 1850; while the superiority in carrying power of our ships is shown by the fact that their registered tonnage has in the interval only trebled. A part of this

difference, however, is due simply to a change in the structure of vessels, whereby more tonnage is acquired without increasing the carrying space as measured according to the official rule.

Next, as to the growth of railways and the assistance thereby progressively rendered to trade since the middle of the century. According to Mr. Mulhall's statistics, the railway mileage of the world was in 1883 twelvefold as great as it was in 1850, the length of iron road having increased from 24,500 miles at the middle of the century to 280,000 miles two years ago. As given by this writer, the railway mileage in the leading countries or regions of the world is stated thus :—

	1850	1883
Europe . . .	14,885 miles	114,196 miles
British Isles . .	6,621 "	18,600 "
United States . .	9,072 "	121,080 "
Canada . . .	—	9,066 "
Spanish America .	—	13,558 "
India . . .	—	10,832 "

Thirty-three years ago, according to Mulhall, the average cost of land carriage was 3*l.* a ton per 100 miles; but now, he says, railways have reduced that average cost to only one-sixth, or 10*s.* a ton per 100 miles—a saving (since the middle of the century) of 2*l.* 10*s.* upon each ton of goods carried over a hundred miles of railway. Also, says Mulhall, the average or medium value of a ton of goods imported by sea into Europe had fallen from 23*l.* in 1870 to 17*l.* 10*s.* in 1883—a change which he attributes to the low shipping freights, which permit and have produced an increase in the profitable transport of cheap or bulky commodities. Obviously, however, such a change must be largely due to another cause; for both freights and the value of goods must have diminished, quite as much as above stated, under the great fall of prices which has occurred since 1870. Further, the goods traffic, or conveyance of merchandise, by railway has increased still more rapidly than by shipping. According to Mulhall, the weight of the goods carried by shipping in 1850 was 25 million tons, and in 1883, 152 million tons, a sixfold increase; whereas, during the same period, the goods carried by railway increased from 97 million tons to 1,080 million tons, an increase elevenfold. Taking

them together, we find that the portion of the world's goods traffic annually carried by sea-going ships and by railways has increased from 122 million tons in 1850 to 1,232 million tons in 1883, or tenfold; while the population of the world, according to the general estimate of one per cent. increase annually, can be barely twenty-five per cent., or only *one quarter*, larger now than in 1850 !

Of telegraph lines throughout the world there are now 700,000 miles, of which 110,000 miles are ocean-cables, connecting continents across the depths of the Atlantic, or establishing comparatively unassailable sea routes of communication as alternatives to the more easily interrupted routes by land. Along one part or other of these telegraph lines 20 millions of messages pass per month, equal to 27,500 per hour, or 458 per minute. In the United Kingdom, the number of telegraphic messages in the course of a year amounts exactly to the total number of the population, or one message annually for each man, woman, and child in the kingdom. In the United States the proportion of telegraphic messages per head is slightly more (being 1·2 per inhabitant annually); and in Australia the proportion is 1·8, or nearly double what it is in this country. As a curious and popularly striking instance of the extent to which geographical distance is annihilated, and time itself abolished or even seemingly forestalled, by means of the lightning-flashed news of the telegraph, we may mention that in London we may receive the announcement of a birth, death, or marriage, &c., at Calcutta, half a dozen hours before the event occurs on the banks of the Hoogly!—that is to say, at 10 P.M. on New Year's eve we may receive a telegram from India announcing that Mr. So-and-so has died at four o'clock on the following morning, and consequently in the new or next year !

It is by means of the electric telegraph that trade now carries on the greater part of its larger transactions, especially with foreign countries; while the kindred invention of the telephone is coming more and more into use for short distances and intra-urban communications. These new agencies of communication are closely connected with our whole system of conveyance, and serve to put into motion our ships and railway traffic in all parts of the world, and even to direct their course or alter their destination. They promote trade by giving a previously unobtainable certainty to mercantile knowledge and calculations. For example, it is a common thing for a merchant ship from India

to be chartered for some Mediterranean port, there to await telegraphic orders as to her ultimate destination, so that her goods may be carried direct to where the market price happens at the time to be highest. The state of the markets and of prices in all parts of the world is daily ascertainable, and contracts between London and Calcutta or San Francisco can now be made in accordance with the exact facts of the hour. The same is true of the other element of commercial or financial bargains—namely, the rate of exchange. Even by means of steam navigation and railways, it would take (say) six weeks or two months to receive news and send orders from London to Calcutta, New Orleans, or San Francisco, and during that time the price of rice, cotton, grain, &c., may rise or fall to a considerable extent, thereby spoiling the calculations upon which contracts were made, and consequently checking trade by deterring merchants from such risky enterprises. Alterations in the rate of exchange are equally unavoidable, and are not less embarrassing. This has become specially important since the demonetisation of silver has done so much to destroy the stability and to enlarge the range of fluctuation in value of the silver currencies of the Eastern world. The value of the Indian rupee in sterling money may in a brief space rise or fall to the extent of a penny, thereby vitiating the calculations of merchants to the extent of about six per cent., which, in these times of small profits, would occasion a serious loss to one or other of the contracting parties, and constitutes a general discouragement to such operations. But, by means of the electric telegraph, both the state of prices and the rate of exchange are ascertained daily, and contracts can be made with perfect accuracy on the closest calculations and narrowest margin of profit, and can be both proposed and ratified on the spot by means of a telegram.

Such, then, are the new agencies—alike of travel, of freight or conveyance, and of intelligence or communication—which have been brought to the aid of trade within our own times, and which have made their mark upon the face and even upon the superficial configuration of the globe. Long lines of steamships, each with its trail of smoke, daily mark the great sea-routes across the globe; while the land is traversed by thousands of steam locomotives, drawing trains of carriages or trucks, which, with steamflag by day and firegleam by night, mark the long straight paths and crossing network of the iron road. These agencies of conveyance, together with the telegraph, have vastly contributed to the

rapid expansion of modern trade. They have immensely facilitated both the exchange of commodities and the transfer of labour to more favourable fields for its employment; and thereby they have created or augmented an effective distant demand for the produce and for the labour of countries which previously had no external market, and where consequently the amount of labour employed and of the natural resources utilised was limited by the local requirements. The outlay upon these means of conveyance and international trade amounts to an enormous sum. According to Mulhall, the capital expended upon the construction and equipment of the world's railways amounts to 5,000 millions sterling; and if we estimate the capital expended upon the sea-going shipping of the world, both steamers and sailing vessels, at an average cost of 12*l.* per ton, the outlay upon the means of navigation must be reckoned roundly at 260 millions sterling, besides a sum of 34½ millions expended on British submarine telegraphs only, and a still larger amount on the land telegraph lines of the world.* The fact that the enormous amount of capital invested in these various undertakings has yielded a fair return in the shape of dividends is the most direct proof of their value or profitable usefulness to the world. And yet it is a startling thought that so enormous a sum should be expended simply upon the me-

* The total length of wire of telegraph land-lines in Europe is about 900,000 miles, the cost of which at 25*l.* per mile would be over 22,500,000*l.*; but the actual outlay by the different Governments for the construction of their telegraph systems doubtless far exceeded this sum. The capital account of the British Post Office Telegraphs is 10,880,571*l.* In extra-European countries, excluding North America, the length of land-wire is roundly 200,000 miles, the estimated cost of which at 50*l.* per mile is 10,000,000*l.* In North America the mileage of the principal telegraph enterprise, viz. the Western Union Company, is about 400,000, and its capital 16,000,000*l.* We have thus a total length of wire on land-lines throughout the world of 1,500,000 miles, costing 48,500,000*l.* The various Governments, principally France and India, own 7,276 miles of cables, the cost of which may be estimated (300*l.* per mile) at 2,182,800*l.*

The rest of the cables are in the hands of private companies, who were the pioneers of this kind of enterprise. In establishing new lines of cable the companies had to incur heavy outlay for concessional rights, building stations, and connecting land-wires; consequently the united capitals of the private submarine cable companies represent a very large total, viz. 34,459,089*l.*, the gross length of their cables being 98,450 miles.

chanical auxiliaries of trade, and merely as one (albeit the chief) branch or portion of the means of exchange! These means of conveyance of themselves produce nothing; nay, the whole appliances of exchange are barren as well as costly in themselves; nevertheless, as the auxiliaries of production, they are among the most potent and valuable of human appliances or operations. One might infer as much from the enormous amount of wealth which the nations have expended, and ceaselessly continue to expend, upon these locomotive agencies—eagerly seeking to improve as well as to enlarge them; but a few lines will suffice to show how real, as well as how far-spreading, is their beneficial influence upon the condition of mankind.

At our own doors, and in its simplest and more direct form, we can observe the process through which conveyance cheapens and enlarges production. By means of a railway or canal, a farmer can bring to his farm the manures and implements which he requires at less cost than before, whereby the cost of production is diminished, so that he can raise a greater quantity of produce than before without any increase of expenditure. In the same way a manufacturer can obtain his raw material, or additional machinery, &c., more cheaply than before, and is thereby enabled to produce more commodities without any additional outlay. Again, by means of improved conveyance, both farmer and manufacturer can send their goods to market or for export at a reduced cost. So that, by these means, a twofold economy is effected—namely, in the cost of production, and also in the cost of distribution or supply; and thus there is created a very considerable gain, which, through trade competition, is enjoyed in varying proportions by the public as well as by the producers. In short, the means of conveyance are also the chief means of exchange, adding alike to the motive and to the power of production, and also to economy of distribution or supply—thereby cheapening and enlarging consumption.

But more than this must be said in connexion with the novel agencies of locomotion which have so greatly assisted modern trade. ‘Time is money,’ says an old proverb, and the truth is strikingly exemplified in the case of steam-traffic and the electric telegraph. The economy of conveyance is not dependent simply on its actual cost or charges, but also upon its speed. A canal is usually the cheapest but also the slowest kind of inland conveyance, and for non-perishable goods of a bulky character (i.e. occupying large

space compared with their value) such conveyance may be the best. But a slow working canal would be of little use for the conveyance of fish, or of the more perishable kinds of fruit and vegetables; nor would it be suitable for the conveyance of valuable merchandise, owing to the lock-up of capital created by the slowness and duration of the journey. It is in speed that the new locomotive agencies so greatly surpass the old ones. And here, again, the economy assumes a twofold shape. The more swiftly the machinery of locomotion can travel, the more work it can do, and the more profit does it yield to its owners in any given time; and also the greater saving of time does it effect for travellers, and the less is the lock-up of capital in goods in the course of transit. For example, in connexion with this last point, say that, previous to railways and telegraphs, it took thirty hours for a letter to go from London to Liverpool, and that it took five or six days to transport heavy goods between the same places; and that now a message by telegraph to Liverpool can be delivered in a few minutes, and that in reply the goods can be carried by railway to London in a single day. The consequent economy is obvious. All merchandise in transit or in store is wealth in a form temporarily unproductive, representing a portion of its owner's capital which is yielding no return; and the longer it remains in this intermediate state—between production and sale or exchange—the larger is the capital required to carry on the business, and the smaller is the amount of profit yielded by it. But, to return to our illustration, by means of quickened communication and conveyance, the time occupied in correspondence and transit is reduced to only one-seventh; while the merchants or manufacturers, instead of having to keep at the least a week's stock of goods on hand, can lessen this stock to the quantity sufficient for a day's supply. Apply such a calculation to the whole stock of goods or contents of warehouses throughout the kingdom, and the truth of the old proverb and the extent of the economy effected by this saving of time will be abundantly apparent.

It is in foreign trade that the beneficial effects of improved conveyance are most conspicuous, and that the connexion between the means or media of exchange and the course of production becomes not only readily intelligible but illustrated visibly on the face of the earth. The most striking instance, perhaps, might be that of a secluded country like California or Australia forty years ago; but rather let us show the effects of modern conveyance upon regions like the

old 'backwoods' of the United States and the vast inland territory of our Indian empire. Without steamboats and railways how long would it not have taken—generations instead of years—before the great wilderness of prairie lands beyond the Mississippi would have been occupied by settlers and cultivation, and become States or territories of the American Union! The soil was as fertile and the climate as favourable fifty years ago, before steam conveyance made its appearance on the scene, as they are now; and families who were content with a rude and simple form of existence could have settled there with a fair certainty of obtaining the means of living. But, without steamboats and railways, how small was the amount of population which could reach these far-away grassy solitudes! and, when settled, the immigrants would have no motive to produce a particle more of anything than was required for their own consumption. But give the means of conveyance—roads, railways, steamboats—and forthwith the bulky agricultural produce of the region becomes marketable; it can be transported as far as New York or New Orleans, and even to Europe, at a charge which leaves a profit to the producer. The settlers find that they can profitably employ their surplus of grain and other produce by exchanging it for the commodities which they desire. Previously they employed only a portion of their working power, and utilised only such part of the resources of the land as was necessary for their own subsistence; but now, having acquired an adequate inducement, they employ their full work-power, and set themselves to turn fully to account the natural resources of the district. Thus industry is augmented, more human labour is applied to profitable production, with corresponding benefits to the workers, while the mass of useful commodities is increased throughout the world. It is under these circumstances that the remarkable settlement of the American 'Far West' has taken place during the last half-century—notably aided by that other means of exchange, a circulating medium, through which capital is lent and borrowed, and the daily work of buying and selling is carried on.

It was about fifty-five years ago that the westward movement of population into the regions beyond the Mississippi began to assume large proportions, advancing and encroaching upon the forest and the prairie at the rate of seventeen miles a year over the greater part of a frontier seventeen hundred miles in length. Of the 680 million acres of State or public lands at its disposal, the United States Government

had then sold 60 millions; and in the year 1828 the sales amounted to 750,000 acres, yielding 221,000*l.*; but the sales rose rapidly until in 1835 they amounted to 7½ million acres, yielding to the Government 2,480,000*l.** And this was only the commencement of the great migration and settlement which, by the aid of steam conveyance, has now carried cultivation to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. Its beneficial effects, through trade, extend over half the world. The surplus produce of the new territories is carried to the great centres of population, and much of it for export to Europe, to be sold or exchanged for manufactures and other commodities, the production of which gives employment and the means of livelihood to thousands of families in our own and other countries.

The introduction of railways into India—which constitutes a notable feature in the commercial progress of the present generation—furnishes a not less striking illustration of the influence of the means of conveyance and exchange in augmenting production alike of raw materials and of manufactures, in increasing, first, the produce of the earth, and next, the fabrics of the factory—together with a general increase of social wellbeing, owing to the multiplying of useful commodities at the service of mankind. But, in the case of India, let us exhibit the beneficial effects of improved conveyance in developing the mineral resources of a country. It was in 1820 that the first coal mine was opened in India, in the Raneegunj district of Bengal, where the coal lay close to the surface and was easily worked, and also adjoined the great highway and waterway through Bengal. In 1854, when a commencement was made of the East India Railway, only three mines had been opened; but this mining industry was prosecuted rapidly, and now there are about sixty coal mines at work in the Raneegunj and neighbouring districts. The East India Railway at once made a market for the coal, which is now employed in working that line; and also, being conveyed by water and railway, it is used ‘in the steamers employed on the river and coasting traffic, ‘in the cotton, jute, and other mills in Calcutta and its ‘vicinity; and for such purposes there is a constantly increasing demand.’† But it is in Central India that the largest coal-seams exist; and hitherto, owing to their distance

* See Alison's ‘History of Europe from 1815 to 1852,’ chap. xliii.

† Trade of British India for the five years 1874–5 to 1878–9. Parl. Paper, 1880, p. 23.

from the sea and from lack of the means of transport, these coal beds have hardly been touched, except to supply the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. Extensive deposits of good coal are known to exist in Northern Assam; but there, as elsewhere, it is impossible to work coal mines efficiently except with a ready means of obtaining labour, machinery, and supplies, and also of profitably disposing of the coal when raised, by means of a ready access to markets through cheap transport. But create a demand—whether on the spot or at any places readily accessible through land or water conveyance—and coal-mining will soon open a new and valuable source of wealth to India. At the present hour a large scheme of this kind is on foot, and is approaching completion. Some fifteen years ago, when Mr. T. Hardy Johnston, C.E., was at the head of the Railway and Public Works Department of the Nizam's Government, an investigation was made of extensive coal beds situated in the north-eastern district of the Hyderabad territories, and which showed that some of these coal-seams were no less than thirty feet in thickness, and at little distance from the surface. If we mistake not, the late Sir Salar Jung, then Prime Minister, was desirous that the Nizam's Government should, of itself, open up this mineral district by means of a railway connecting, *via* Hyderabad, with the trunk line between Madras and Bombay. Subsequently, the Government of India has taken a keen interest in the development of these coal fields; the project was taken up by the Hyderabad-Chanda Railway Company, which was registered rather more than two years ago, whose line is expected to reach the Singareni coal fields within eighteen months from the present time. Meanwhile an English company has obtained from the Nizam's Government a most extensive mining concession, and arrangements for the opening of pits in the Singareni district are already in progress in anticipation and for the supply of the coming railway. In like manner the aid of railways is about to be brought to the working of the gold rocks of Mysore—thereby adding one more to the many services which steam conveyance has conferred upon our Indian empire, and which have served to extend alike the power of the Government and the social wellbeing of the people.

One needs only to look around and to compare the present times with those of our youth, to be assured of the vast power and beneficial operation of these new agencies which have aided in the recent commercial progress of the world. Not less worthy of consideration is the principle which

underlies the achievement of these new agents, and which, indeed, is indispensable to all truly civilised progress. However various in external forms may be the course of human progress, which, beginning with rudimentary industry, gradually attains to the leisure requisite for the development of the higher powers and nobler emotions—elevating the intellect and humanising the fierce struggle for existence with which the history of mankind begins—the grand principle has to be observed that industrial or material results must be produced with a diminishing expenditure of human labour. The characteristic feature of civilisation—of that growth of the higher powers of man which is ennobling life and beautifying the world—the principle upon which all this rich progress depends, consists in the attainment of two opposite and apparently incompatible results. Production must increase, while the labour of production must diminish. As a pre-requisite, or at least as an accompaniment and aid of civilisation, the amount of useful production—especially the supply of the necessities and comforts of life—must augment more rapidly than population itself augments. The same amount of population must possess a larger supply of the food which ministers to physical development, and of the leisure and luxuries which are the handmaid of refinement and of intellectual growth. A mere increase of production goes for little: it is needful, of course, for the support of the natural growth of population, but, if attended by an equal expenditure of labour, it can merely serve to keep things as they were, and does nothing for human elevation or social progress. An increase of bodily toil is incompatible with the development of man's higher faculties; beyond a certain point, bodily exertion serves directly to enfeeble the intellect, and to deaden the moral and emotional nature. As may be seen too much even in modern States, an increased exertion of physical effort, as through a prolongation of the hours of daily work, diminishes the intelligence of the workers, and would end by reducing them to the level of the lower animals. How, then, is this evil to be overcome, and the happy object attained of increasing the necessities and comforts of life without increasing human toil, and without destroying the leisure or reserve power requisite for intellectual growth and moral elevation?

It is human invention—it is the mind or the understanding, which solves the problem, and which of late has been accomplishing its mission to a degree and with a rapidity

previously unknown or undreamt of. The amount of Force in the world is incalculable: and it is the application of man's intelligence to the natural forces, or sources of power around him, which enables him to augment his own working power independently of any increase of bodily toil. From the outset he has made use of the power of the lower animals, and also learnt to employ the winds and water as motive forces; then he sets himself to investigate the subtler or latent powers of nature, and gradually, through suitable and ever improving apparatus, enlists some of them in his service. In this way the power of man works through machinery, and thereby becomes increased immeasurably beyond the force that belongs to or is inherent in himself. The result is the same as if human power had experienced an extraordinary developement. In civilised communities, one man is now equal in productive capacity to ten or twenty men in earlier times. To multiply the potency of anything is, as regards power, the same as to multiply the thing itself—indeed, it is very much better, inasmuch as this increase of power is obtained without a corresponding increase in the cost of maintenance and working.

It is upon this principle that the great industrial improvements here passed in review have proceeded. The increase of productive power achieved through steam-driven machinery in all its various forms is incalculable: confine the calculation to the steam locomotive alone, and the result is startling in its magnitude. In 1866 M. Chevalier reckoned that the 16,500 locomotive engines then at work in Europe were equal in power to nearly eight million horses, or equivalent to the muscular power of about forty millions of adult and healthy men. And as such men constitute barely a fifth of the population, it follows that the addition made to human force during the previous forty years by the employment of steam-locomotives in Europe was the same as would have arisen if the population of our continent in 1866 had been 200 millions larger than it actually was.* The improvements which have been made and continue to be made in the steam locomotive furnish an admirable illustration of the general type of invention which is ceaselessly aiding and promoting modern civilisation and wellbeing through comparatively costless additions to productive power. The

* Discours prononcé au Collège de France à l'ouverture du Cours d'Economie Politique, le 18 décembre 1866, par M. Michel Chevalier, Membre de l'Institut, &c.

highest amount of steam-pressure which James Watt found attainable was 12 lbs. on the square inch; in 1866 the force developed was ten times as great, or 120 lb. on the square inch. In 1829 the most powerful locomotive that could be constructed (the 'Rocket') could draw only three times its own weight at a speed of fifteen miles an hour; in 1866 a powerful locomotive was able to draw ten times its own weight at a speed of twenty miles an hour. During the same period, the quantity of fuel required for generating a given amount of steam had been diminished by five-sixths; in other words, in 1866 one pound of coal sufficed to develop as much force as six pounds of coal did in 1826. And this process of improvement still goes on, the motive force being more and more economised and efficiently applied through improvements of apparatus.* And this process acts and reacts throughout our whole industrial system. It was the vast powers of the steam-engine which first enabled us to work our invaluable coal beds, and greatly facilitated our iron manufacture; and every improvement of the steam engine by lessening the cost of coal mining and of iron manufacture lessens also the cost of the fuel and of the raw material of its own structure. No doubt the refinements of workmanship and completer fittings of the modern steam engine might or do add to the cost or difficulty of its construction; but, not to speak of the simultaneous cheapening of the ironwork employed in its structure, and of the coal used in its working—every such improvement in mechanism and mechanical appliances repays a hundred times the cost of effecting it. New agencies of power, or improvements upon existing ones, are not obtained for nothing—railways alone have caused a new industrial expenditure to the amount of 5,000 millions sterling—but their cost is repaid abundantly by the new or augmented service which they render to mankind. So obvious a truth seems hardly to need mention, but, unless it

* The most recent improvement in the developement or economy of steam-power in navigation is the construction of engines on the 'triple expansion' principle, whereby the steam from the boilers is passed through three cylinders, each succeeding cylinder being smaller than the one before it—thus obtaining a maximum amount of power out of the steam before it is allowed to reach the condensers. This 'triple expansion' form of engines has been successfully tried in the P. and O. steamer 'Bengal' (4,500 tons), which, as we write, has just made the voyage out to Australia and back, and, it is reported, with a saving of 20 per cent. of coal, while maintaining the previous maximum rate of speed.

be kept in mind, an important matter may be overlooked when we come to the remaining factor of exchange and locomotive of value—namely, the circulating medium, which we have now to deal with in connexion with the fall of prices and the cheapening influence upon commodities of the new agencies of locomotion and conveyance.

Money, the last and completing link in the process of exchange, and which is known as pre-eminently ‘the medium ‘of exchange,’ has undergone improvements or economies of power similar in character to those which we have described in connexion with the other and initial or preliminary agencies of exchange—namely, the means of conveyance. Under the system of barter there were and always must be serious obstructions to exchanges, and, consequently, to the industrial and commercial wellbeing which springs from them. Needless to say, money solves these difficulties at once. A coin or two serves to cover any acknowledged want of equivalence in the articles to be exchanged. Further, when a trader is willing to dispose of his goods, yet does not desire any of the articles offered in exchange for them, a payment in coin at once satisfies him, and completes the desired transaction. He receives for his goods an equivalent in money—in a form of value wellnigh imperishable, conveniently kept and readily utilised, and which he can employ at will in the purchase either of goods or of labour. Unlike any other kind of property, the money can be kept for any time without either expense or loss of value; and also it is more widely exchangeable—its effective value in exchange is greater—than that of any other kind of property.

The value of a thing depends upon its amount of usefulness—upon its capacity for doing useful things; and (*cæteris paribus*) the greater the number of useful things that a commodity can purchase, or the greater the number of gratifications or useful services which it can obtain for its possessor, the greater is the value of that commodity. Money can perform more services in this way than any other thing. Of all kinds of property it is the most capable of being exchanged for other commodities at pleasure. And this superiority of money over all other kinds of property is expressed by, or lies at the root of, the old proverb, that ‘the ‘seller is the servant of the buyer.’ In other words, it is more difficult to sell, or to convert ordinary commodities into money, than to buy, or convert money into other commodities—money being the more useful article and the most generally desired. It is property in its most condensed,

least perishable, and most readily available form—property, ‘mobilised,’ and exchangeable in the highest degree. A free exchange of goods is a requisite of social wellbeing; and from the earliest times civilised communities saw that it was advantageous for them to devote a portion of their wealth or labour for the sake of providing themselves with money, in the form of the precious metals, in order to facilitate production, industry, and the general comforts of life. This was precisely analogous or equivalent to the making of roads. Money facilitates the transfer of property—the locomotion of value—just as roads and the other means of conveyance facilitate the transfer of commodities from one place to another.

The parallel between roads and money is as complete as any illustration of one thing by another can be. Both roads and money are simply means to an end. They constitute no addition to the stock of commodities which support life; of themselves they produce nothing at all. On the contrary, they are or occasion a subtraction from the stock of useful commodities and also of labour. Roads occupy land more or less capable of production, and also, together with the machinery of conveyance, they absorb (or withdraw from other uses) in their construction a large amount of labour. Money consists of the precious metals, which are only obtainable through labour, and absorbs the larger portion of the gold and silver of the world—not in articles of ornament which gratify the senses, but simply in passing from hand to hand, or in lying locked up out of sight in strong boxes, under watchful precautions for its security. Nevertheless both roads and money, the means of conveyance and of exchange, serve vastly to augment human power and the enjoyment of life. Together, they extend the beneficial work of exchange all over the world; creating an effective demand for production in localities which previously had no external market, thereby calling into profitable play productive labour for which there had been no motive, and resources of the soil for which there had been no requirement; and simultaneously, in the older countries or seats of civilisation, more employment and profit are created through the production and supply of those articles of manufacture which are suitable and requisite for trading with the other and less advanced countries. In this way production is increased, more labour is rendered profitable, and the stock of useful commodities is increased, all over the world. Hence, as by a universal instinct, mankind in all countries have set apart certain

commodities to act as money—to facilitate exchanges, whether of goods or labour, and to store property in a convenient and readily available form. By devoting a portion of their labour or property to this purpose, they found that all the rest of their labour and commodities became many times more useful and profitable to them—acquiring a higher value through the machinery of money, just as the same things do through the means of conveyance and the machinery of locomotion. Money, too, is the most convenient, or indeed the only practicable form in which capital or property can be lent or applied to the varied purposes of industry and of civilised life; it may be styled the material of loanable capital. Gradually, therefore, all estimates of the value of things came to be reckoned in this medium of exchange. Contracts were made in it, services and obligations reckoned in it; and thus money, besides being necessary for the countless daily exchanges of domestic life and of universal trade, has become a general measure of value, whose influence often extends over years, in some cases even for generations, and every change in which must more or less disturb the fabric of society, by affecting the whole industrial, commercial, and financial relations of the community.

At present a serious disturbance of this kind is in progress, and although we do not here desire to discuss the question of remedial measures for the scarcity of gold, we may seasonably state the principle and line of progress through which the monetary system has reached its present economical excellence. The monetary means of exchange have been improved on precisely the same principle as the means of conveyance have been—namely, by augmenting the potency of the agent independently of increasing its quantity or cost to mankind. First, by banking, whereby the spare coin of a community, being deposited in bank, remains at the free disposal of its owners on demand, while nearly all of it (say nine-tenths) can be lent by the bank and profitably employed by others. Next, paper money in the form of bank notes and cheques: the notes being promises to pay in coin issued by the banks, and the cheques being orders upon the banks to pay in cash issued by depositors. Bills, which are far older than either bank notes or cheques, are an economy of capital rather than of money: they do not lessen payments in money, but they give time to traders to sell or profitably dispose of goods which they have bought, and with the money thus obtained to pay for

the goods while also pocketing the profit ; while the first seller of the goods, by discounting the trader's bill, gets payment at once, and is enabled to invest the sum anew in profitable business. Thus, by the bill-system, a seller never for a day loses the value of his goods, yet simultaneously these goods are being profitably traded in by the buyer. At the same time these commercial bills duly endorsed are capable of acting as wholesale currency in trading and financial circles, more or less widely, according to the credit or reputation of the drawers and endorsers ; and in foreign or international trade and payments, bills are very extensively used in this way, and effect a great economy by settling the balance of trade between countries without the transmission of coin or bullion.

Finally, there is the 'clearing' system, through which banks settle their manifold accounts without the interchange of money, and simply by transfers of credit to one another in the books of the Bank of England. A further economy and actual profit would be effected if the 'clearing' were made, as among the Scotch banks, by transfers of consols. Indeed, were it not beyond our present purpose, we might show how widely a system of banking credit and clearing transactions based on the Government securities of each country could be established for the settlement of international balances and other payments, effecting a considerable saving of bullion, and with a profit (as compared with the present system) to the banks which took part in it. More important still—indeed, pre-eminently important—is the advantage thereby to be attained of putting an end to those rapid and transient drains of specie from one country to another, which, howsoever brief, ever and anon convulse the commerce and industry of large portions of the world, and particularly of our own country.

What, then, has been the influence of these changes—of the recent improvements in the means of conveyance and exchange—upon the present position of trade and money ? In the opinion of the recent conference of French bankers, trade throughout the world has quadrupled since 1848 ; according to Mulhall, the increase has been sixfold. Such estimates, at the best, can only be approximations to the truth. But everyone can remember the bright and marvelously prosperous times which prevailed in our own country and throughout the world for full twenty years after 1852, and which made the third quarter of the present century a veritable golden age. We have already described the general

increase of production, both in the produce of the earth and of the factory, multiplying the stock of commodities useful to mankind, and increasing the value of each man's labour as measured in, or by his command over, these useful commodities. But now we have a very different state of matters to consider, and a more complicated question to answer. The improved agencies of conveyance, which chiefly contributed to the general prosperity, are still in full play, but they are showing another side, and are attended by a return of trade toward the 'hard times' which had preceded their introduction and general adoption. The pendulum has taken a backward swing; but why? Some learned men talk imposingly about seasons of good and bad trade, or of human prosperity and adversity occurring in fixed alternations inevitably and inscrutably, and that no more can be said. This is no explanation; and in so pre-eminently important a matter as that of national and social wellbeing, it would be a failure of duty were we to rest content in ignorance instead of seeking to trace the changing phenomena to their fundamental causes, so as to contribute towards the ultimate attainment of a solution of the difficulty, whether through alleviation or by permanent removal.

These new or modern agencies of locomotion and communication, which have so largely promoted the expansion of trade and production, had become fully established in general use at the middle of the century, and had entered upon that steady and rapid course of developement and extension which continued in full play for five-and-twenty years—say, until 1874; since then it has been checked, sharing in the stagnation or diminished progress which has befallen all other branches of industrial enterprise during the last dozen years. Thus, the first stage of maturity for these new agencies of conveyance and communication—viz. railways, oceanic steam-navigation, and the electric telegraph—was contemporaneous with the discovery of the rich gold mines of California and Australia, which, by furnishing the monetary means of exchange, co-operated with the new locomotive and telegraphic agencies in the remarkable expansion of trade and of general prosperity which forthwith ensued. But it is to be observed that, although both the new gold and the new agencies of conveyance were beneficial in themselves, and promoted the same beneficial end—namely, the expansion of trade and production, and the consequential increase of social and national wellbeing—these new forces or agents were in one important

respect rivals. And what is more—curious as such a fact may be—this rivalry or mutually counteracting influence at first, and for full twenty years, greatly added to the beneficent character of each of them. That either of them separately would not have produced so much prosperity for mankind as the two together have done, will be readily—indeed, instantly—admitted; but we repeat that, although the new gold and the new means of conveyance and of communication were fundamentally similar in character as regards the promotion of trade and production with the concomitant benefits to mankind, nevertheless these new agents or forces were in one important respect antagonistic; and this antagonism for a time actually heightened the benefit which the world derived from them.

An increase in the supply of the precious metals as money has always, as an historic fact, been productive of beneficial effects upon society at large: so much so that Hume, as keen and profound a thinker as modern literature can show, was of opinion that ‘the good policy of the magistrate [in such ‘matters] consists only in keeping the stock of money, if ‘possible, still increasing.’ As Hume himself doubts the possibility of such a course, the sentence is probably meant to be simply a highly emphatic statement of an abstract proposition—of a thing in itself desirable, although probably not attainable. But he makes the further and unqualified statement that the condition of affairs ‘is as pernicious to ‘industry when gold and silver are diminishing, as it is ‘advantageous when these metals are increasing.’ Nevertheless, in this as in all other matters, it is a question of degree. Irrigation, a moderate or suitable distribution of water to the soil for the purpose of promoting vegetation, is one of the most valuable agents or aids of agricultural production; but a flood, a sudden and excessive inundation, although it may not be devoid of some useful consequences, is on the whole disastrous. Even so, a new supply of the precious metals so large as to revolutionise the value of money—say by reducing its purchasing power by one-half or more in the course of a few years—is of very questionable advantage at any time, and would be widely injurious at the present day. Three centuries ago such a monetary revolution occurred—in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and the first Stuart kings—when the complaints were far more numerous, or at least more noticeable, than were any expressions of satisfaction. This may be partly attributable to the fact that the classes who suffered most, or those who had most

property which would be depreciated in monetary value, were the only ones who could publicly record their complaints; yet it is not less true that the labouring classes suffered and grumbled quite as much as their betters. Indeed, as is natural at all times, all classes gave more heed to the hardships of the case than to the benefits, which were so wide and enduring. But the constitution and also the general condition of society in Europe in the sixteenth century could bear shocks and changes of this kind much better than is possible under the more complex social and commercial arrangements, and especially under the universal prevalence of monetary contracts, of the present age. Europe in the first half of the sixteenth century, from lack of a circulating medium, was like a country which has been reduced to barrenness from lack of rain, and to which a pluvial deluge, even if of tropical severity, cannot fail to do far more good than harm.

In the present age, such a change in the circulating medium and measure of value as was predicted a quarter of a century ago by Chevalier, Cobden, and Jevons would undoubtedly have been as calamitous as the last named and soundest of these authorities apprehended—albeit we regard as exaggerated the terrors expressed in anticipation by Chevalier and his English translator, who seem to have had eyes only for one side of the question. Indeed, Professor Jevons himself wholly failed to perceive that important beneficial influence of the gold discoveries which nevertheless served to falsify his own calculated predictions. It was the counteracting effects of a rapidly expanding trade, assisted by the new agencies which invention had recently before placed at its service, which steadied the measure of value, and prevented the great expected fall in the value of gold, by usefully multiplying the requirements for money. Contemporaneous with the gold discoveries, and greatly helped by them—alike as supplying in abundance the monetary means of exchange and the material of loanable capital, and also by the moral influences of hope and energy which these world-exciting discoveries did so much to beget and sustain—trade, immediately followed and partly accompanied by production, entered upon a singularly rapid developement, and one which (owing to the rise of prices, which swelled the official statistics of foreign trade) appeared even greater than it was, proportionately exciting the general enthusiasm. There ensued more employment for labour, both in profitable production and in the work of conveyance and ex-

change, creating a requirement for more money in payment of wages and salaries, in freights, commissions, and the like ; while the increase of income or profits to employers, together with the increased demand and competition for labour, caused the larger amount of employment to be accompanied by a higher rate of pay. This increased expenditure in wages and salaries naturally led to a larger expenditure in consumption, &c., on the part of the recipients, the industrial classes, just as the increased profits or income of the employers led on their part to a similar result ; so that buying and selling increased, and the requirement for money became largely enhanced throughout the entire civilised community. Further, while the monetary requirements of the world were thus augmented, absorbing in a beneficial manner no small portion of the new gold, it happened, as the result of the increased production and supply of marketable commodities, that the things measured in money augmented simultaneously (although, at first, not proportionately) with the stock of money, thereby tending to maintain an equipoise between money and goods, and checking any serious change in the value of the circulating medium.

In this way the new gold mines, co-operating with trade, produced a great increase of individual wellbeing and national prosperity, without occasioning any mischievous or objectionable change in the value of money. Indeed, the monetary doctrine which has been so predominant since the early portion of the century, that any additional issue or supply of money necessarily 'depreciates' the currency—in the sense of reducing its ordinary or normal value—is fundamentally wrong. The most disastrous mistake in the scientific theories about money has arisen from the failure to perceive that (barring State issues, usually of inconvertible notes) more money can get into circulation only through being employed in new or augmented production, or in trade which employs labour and engenders production ; so that the influence of the additional currency upon prices may be wholly, and is always partly, nullified by the new business transactions which it serves to perform, and by the increase of exchangeable commodities or property upon the production of which the money is employed. We cannot do more than thus state the question here ; but no correct or even approximately correct understanding of the operation of money and trade upon prices is possible without a clear perception and adequate appreciation of this truth.

Thus it happened that the apprehension of a revolutionary

fall in the value of gold, and of money in general, was not realised. Nevertheless a fall, which at its maximum was considerable, in the value of money did set in after the Australian mines came to augment the new gold supply from California; but, barring exceptional moments and cases, we think the maximum rise of prices due to the new mines, and which was reached in 1856-7, fell short of 25 per cent. Owing to the issue of inconvertible paper money throughout the United States during the civil war, and by Italy in 1865, in preparation for her premeditated war with Austria—events which set loose for general circulation upwards of a hundred millions sterling of coin, equivalent to an equal increase (of about thirty millions sterling annually during the three years) in the contemporaneous yield of the mines—a still higher level of prices was reached in 1863-6; and the epoch of high prices and general prosperity, albeit with much fluctuation, continued until 1874, terminating decisively in the following year. Indeed, were we asked to fix the turning point—the watershed dividing the ‘golden age’ from the hard times now in progress—we should fix it in November 1873, contemporaneous with the monetary or banking crisis which then occurred, especially in the United States and our own country.

It is a remarkable fact—obvious though the truth may be—that, owing to the unceasing growth of population, and also of a higher standard or ideas of comfort such as civilisation engenders, there soon occurs a stage or *punctum temporis* at which the produce of the precious metals, even from the richest of mines, is overtaken by the requirement for these metals, in their twofold use as money and as ornaments. This was most strikingly exemplified throughout the three last centuries, when the change in the value of money was completed and the rise in the level of prices came to a full stop before 1650, although the produce of the gold and silver mines went on increasing (even doubling and trebling) for more than a century and a half thereafter. *A fortiori*, no sooner does the supply of coin or money become stationary, than money begins to be scarce—inadequate to the ever-growing wants of the civilised world; and a fall of prices sets in. Accordingly it was beyond historic reason to expect that the reign of high prices, arising from the new gold and silver mines, would be an enduring condition of the world. Blessings seldom come unmixed, and never are immortal; but they come often enough perhaps, and at times in most valuable magnitude, creating golden epochs for the

world, and leaving rich fruitage behind, if men or nations will but make good use of these opportunities of happiness or prosperity. Look at the mighty impulse to progress which was communicated to Europe by the discovery of America, together with the flood of the precious metals which then poured into a continent from which money had wellnigh disappeared, and which had hardly begun to awake from the long barbaric slumber of the Dark Ages. These events served to launch Europe upon her new career of civilisation and dominion, enabling her first to reclaim her own freedom by throwing off the yoke of the Asiatic conquerors—Moors, Mongols, Turks—who then held the eastern half of Europe up to Warsaw, Vienna, and Venice, besides occupying Spain, and lording it in their galleys over the length and breadth of the Mediterranean Sea; and thereafter, masters in their own house, the European nations began to carry the work of conquest, commerce, and colonisation into every quarter of the globe. Despite this rapid progress of the European world, so great was the number and richness of the American mines, that the supply of money sufficed to sustain that progress almost without break for three centuries, and until advancing civilisation had invented for its wants various monetary economies, and a partial substitute for the canonised metals, the production of which is so fitful.

In our own day, another epoch of monetary abundance has come and gone. It has been very brief, but it was peerlessly rich in the precious metals, and its exceeding brevity has been largely due to human wastefulness. ‘Man hath sought out many inventions,’ it was said of old; but surely a rasher act of deliberate legislation is hard to find than that by which some of the leading Governments of the world have demonetised silver, which forms about one-half of the entire metallic circulation of the globe. Apart from any special study of monetary science, any man well acquainted with the broad course of history would have been aware of the facts which we have just mentioned—namely, that a stationary currency (without ever-increasing economies in its use) is incompatible with national progress or social prosperity; and that even a steadily increasing yield of the gold and silver mines, on the largest scale that the world has ever seen, is sure to be overtaken by the growing requirements and demand for these metals arising from the ceaseless expansion of trade, population, and realised wealth, which require both more money and a larger consumption of

the precious metals in personal ornaments and decorative art. But for the recent legislative acts of demonetisation the world would still (despite the gradual decline of the gold mines) have possessed a circulating medium fairly adequate, or not seriously inadequate, for its wants—sustaining with little diminution, although no longer capable of extending, the benefits which were so conspicuous during the previous quarter of a century. Assuredly, then, the world through its legislators has failed to reap the full benefit of the new gold and silver mines—the most marvellous discovery and outpouring of the precious metals which has ever been known; and in not a few thoughtful and philosophic minds the apprehension grimly arises as to whether, and how far, these contagious legislative mistakes are not hastening a crisis in which our modern or European system of civilisation will have to pass through a supreme ordeal, the very thought of which is appalling.

In a previous article* we have shown how the present monetary dearth has been produced, through the demonetisation of silver and the growing scarcity of gold. At present it only remains to point out another important element of the case—namely, the influence upon our monetary position of the vast expansion which trade has undergone since the middle of the century, with the help of the new agencies of conveyance and communication. We have just shown how the rapid expansion of trade which quickly followed, and indeed partly accompanied, the new gold discoveries, besides its general benefits to the world, exerted a fortunate influence upon money, checking the rise of prices, or fall in the value of the circulating medium, in the most beneficial way—namely, through increasing the profitable requirements for money by multiplying the commodities and services which are measured in money. Manifestly, however, when the tide turned and the supply of money was lessened, the influence of this industrial progress upon the circulating medium assumed a very different character; and the fact that the world had advanced largely in trade, production, and population, as well as in realised wealth, operated directly and powerfully to create a scarcity of the circulating medium, and to make this monetary dearth the parent of widespread distress. ‘Pleasure and pain,’ it has been said, ‘enter through the same portals;’ and in exact

* See the ‘Ed. Review’ for January 1886, Art. ‘The Scarcity of Gold.’

proportion to the maturity of civilisation or to the magnitude of civilised prosperity is the disaster produced by the failure or contraction of one of its elemental supports.

The question dates from 1874. It is impracticable, in an accurate and satisfactory manner, to compare the addition made to the stock of gold and silver coin since 1850 with the increase which has contemporaneously occurred in trade, labour, and the stock of commodities, or in that further requirement for the precious metals, both as money and in ornaments, which attends an increase of realised wealth and capital. But we may speak with fair confidence upon this, the most pertinent point in the case: namely, that in consequence of the serious diminution of the circulating medium since 1873, unaccompanied by any new economy of money, it is impossible that the still greater volume of trade at the present time (together with an increase of about 15 per cent. in the world's population*) can be carried on at the same price level, either for commodities or for labour and services. That this is the state of matters at present, and that it has been visibly in progress for several years past, is beyond question. We need not occupy space by printing evidence of the fall of prices, which is very fully set forth by Mr. Goschen, Mr. Hansard, and in several reports by the Statistical Department of the Board of Trade, the titles of which publications are prefixed to this article. Even the extent of the average fall may be pretty confidently stated at about 25 per cent. within the last dozen years—a rise in the value of money, and in the weight of all monetary contracts and indebtedments, of most serious extent, and absolutely unparalleled in the rapidity of its occurrence. The loss thereby occasioned to the whole industrial classes is both more severe and more extensive than is generally understood. For, as all trade and production is largely carried on under fixed monetary charges, the loss resulting from a fall of prices must be met almost entirely out of the profits or net surplus alone; and consequently with a most serious reduction not only of income, but also of the value of the entire productive property, whether it be land or manufacturing plant, ships, warehouses, &c.

'Over-production' is the common explanation of the present depression of trade, just as it was sixty and sixty-five years ago under a similar visitation. Indeed, as we have

* In the British Isles the increase of population since 1873 amounts to $2\frac{1}{4}$ millions, or 13 per cent.

shown on a previous occasion, the commercial aspect of a monetary dearth is always that of a 'universal glut.' And in one sense, of course, the phrase 'over-production' is right enough, inasmuch as both labour and commodities, all the things which are paid for or exchanged in money, exist in larger proportion than hitherto compared with the reduced stock of money. But this is merely to state the case as we have just done, but in other words which do not explain how this crisis has arisen. The special feature of the depression is a fall of prices, and a consequential loss of profits both to producers and traders, and which, sooner or later, must lead to lower wages and diminished employment for the working classes—as has already occurred and is extending among clerks and other salaried trade assistants. But what does this so-called 'over-production,' which manifestly extends to human labour as well as to commodities, really mean? Is the source of the difficulty that commodities are now being produced beyond the requirements of mankind? Lord Derby once warned the Lancashire manufacturers against over-production by reminding them that, however many stockings they might produce from their looms, men have only two feet! Is it, then, an explanation of the present depression, which extends alike to agriculture and to manufactures, that mankind possess enough of the necessaries and comforts of life, so that they do not compete, nor need to compete, as hitherto, in the purchase of them? This would be over-production in the proper meaning of the word. But assuredly no one will advance such a statement. Or is the employment of labour and the production of commodities, relatively to the increase of the population, greater than it was a dozen years ago, just before this fall of prices began? Again the answer must be *No*. Until recently, the volume of trade continued to expand, but its rate of expansion has been declining, and now threatens to come to a stop. And, as need hardly be said, a non-progressive state of trade and production, less commodities and less employment, coexistent with the ceaseless growth of population, is not merely a negative but a positive disaster. It means a failure to maintain the present social condition, and an actual backward movement alike in the state of our people and in the stock of capital which is the motive power of industrial and commercial enterprise.

These brief questions and considerations seem to us to bring the question to a definite issue. No doubt the labour of production and of conveyance has been much reduced, and

the facilities of exchange have been much augmented, since the middle of the century ; and it has been our object in the first half of this article to show how this has occurred. But, apart from the question as to whether any notable economies in these respects have been achieved since 1874—excepting in the production of steel—is it not the case that if the lessened cost of production and supply were the grand cause of the recent fall of prices, we should see the producing and conveying classes quite as prosperous as before, or more so ? Do manufacturers, or producers of any kind, who by invention or superior management cheapen their production—are these men losers thereby ? Take, for example, the Bessemer process and other recent improvements in the treatment of iron and production of steel. No doubt the selling price of steel wares becomes lowered, but do the manufacturers suffer, or is the demand for labour reduced ? Does labour languish and starve in consequence of becoming more productively effective ? If the invention or improvement be not a monopoly, competition among the manufacturing firms serves to secure for the public a reduction of price, but certainly not to the extent of destroying the fair or ordinary profits on production. As a rule, and under all ordinary conditions, the producers benefit *pari passu* with the consumer. Naturally, and rightly, they look after their own profits first, and the reduction made in the selling price is fully covered, indeed much more than compensated, by the profit on the larger amount of sales. In other words, a fall of prices arising from cheapened cost of production or supply is attended by prosperity ; the gain from lower price in which consumers rejoice being accompanied by at least an equal gain to the classes who produce and supply the commodities. But is this the case at present ? Rather we should ask, is not the case the very opposite of this ? Is there general prosperity or anything like it ? Do the producers and conveyers get their profits as they used to do until 1874 or thereabouts ? Are they as well off as they used to be for a score of years or more after the produce of the Californian and Australian gold mines began to come into the markets of the world ? So far from this being the case, the whole body of the industrial classes—both agriculturists and manufacturers, whether employers or employed, as well as merchants and the conveying interests by land or sea—all alike suffer from ‘hard times,’ and the general subject of complaint is a loss of profits in consequence of falling prices. What is more, the class of capitalists (banks included) who do not

directly engage in trade, yet who furnish the loanable wealth which sets in motion the wheels of industry—do not they also suffer from a fall in price of their own special commodity, loanable capital, which at present (from lack of demand for it) does not yield half its ordinary return in the shape of interest?

If over-production were the cause of the present depression of trade, the natural and obvious remedy would, of course, be a diminution of production. The farmer ought to throw part of his ground out of cultivation, or leave part of the productive powers of the soil unutilised; the manufacturer should cease to employ his full plant or machinery; while shipping and railway companies should put aside still more of their ships into dock or their locomotives under sheds; and thereby, *ex hypothesi*, all these and other branches of trade ought to be benefited. But what sane man would propose such a course? The result would not be remedy, but increased suffering—further losses to employers, and a universal reduction in the employment of labour. The explanation of much of the continued production and trade is simply that it is meant to lessen an *inevitable loss*, as by working double shifts or longer hours in order to get more work out of the fixed capital and plant. True, with each increase of production and supply, the disparity between the stock of money and the quantity of commodities and of employed labour becomes augmented, so that the level of prices falls still lower. Yet what is trade to do? Were people to cease to work, they must starve; and consequently they must be content to work longer hours or with less pay; whereby the condition of the people must retrograde, and the social system suffer serious damage. Indeed, in the case of all classes who carry on business under leases and such-like monetary contracts, whether they be farmers or manufacturers—or even who have invested their own money in the farm, or ship, or factory—a stoppage of business is too obviously suicidal to need remark. But let us quote an instance which is really illustrative of the whole case. A trustworthy authority—the writer on ‘Trade and Finance’ in the ‘Daily News’—commenting upon the stagnation in our textile industries two years ago, reported as follows:

‘A manufacturer whose concern is by no means a large one—400 looms and 18,000 spindles—tells me that unless he was losing 50*l.* a week (2,600*l.* a year) it would not be worth his while to stop, for a closed factory is a veritable white elephant. There is, first of all, the loss of capital lying idle, and on cottages, the rent of which cannot be

collected. Then the mill must be watched and warmed, the roof kept water-tight, and the machinery free from rust; and when all this is done the start must be a time of trouble and confusion. The oil is stiff on the wheels and bearings, the rooms are cold and damp, yarns and cloth in operation are deteriorated, workpeople are scattered, and weeks may elapse before a shattered organisation can be restored, and a mill brought once more into satisfactory working order.'

In truth, it is only the wealthiest employers who can afford to stop; to the great majority stoppage is ruin. The small mill owners 'keep going,' either on full or on short time, at all hazards, trusting to a turn of the tide to save them from an ultimate smash. If we turn to coalpits and to ironworks, with their costly machinery and blast furnaces, the heavy loss which must attend a stoppage, and which is so deterrent from such a course, is still more obvious. Indeed, in the case of a coalpit, stoppage is attended by such quick and dire dilapidation, that such a step is almost equivalent to abandonment. It is these and similar facts which explain how it is that no serious stoppage of production and of industrial employment has yet occurred—a phenomenon which has led a few theorising optimists to deny that there is any loss of profits at all. Hitherto the loss has been borne almost entirely by the employers, who have struggled on, 'bleeding at every pore,' in the hope that the tide will turn before they are utterly exhausted, so as to enable them to float their ventures anew, and in a field left comparatively bare of competitors.

Thus the question, so serious under any circumstances, as to the probable duration of this depression, becomes invested with a peculiar gravity. Doubtless there are many cheerful opinions current on the subject; but our own hopes lie more in the good quality of our people, and in the inventive or adaptive powers of civilised communities, than from any natural termination of the monetary difficulty which at present is so obstructive to commercial prosperity. Some writers, like Mr. Giffen,* while acknowledging that we have entered upon a period of falling prices, see nothing disquieting in the prospect, and even anticipate that 'trade generally will be sounder.' Others, finding comfort in a hope, say: 'It is only a question of money and prices;

* 'What will be the effects on trade of such a course of prices as there seems reason to anticipate? I am disposed to conclude that on balance the results will not be injurious. . . . Trade generally will be sounder.' See 'Contemporary Review,' June 1885, p. 819.

‘and as soon as we have accommodated ourselves to a new level of prices, things will go on just as before. The time of transition is hard to bear, but it must soon be over.’ We wish we could think so; we should be glad if either reason or experience, if either history or the facts of the day, justified so cheerful a belief. We are not unhopeful, but our hope does not lie in the natural coming of a new level of prices, under which trade is to go on as before. The remedy must come from man’s own action—from legislation and international accord or co-operation in monetary matters. We do not underrate the difficulty to be encountered in this remedial work—on the contrary, we keep it clearly in view; and if we have endeavoured to probe the evil to its core, it is with a full consciousness that until the magnitude of the present fall in the value of productive industry and the exceeding difficulty of dealing with it are clearly recognised, it is utterly hopeless to expect a hearing for any proposals of remedial change in the existing monetary system, or to attain any permanent relief from the paralysis which for ten years has been so grievously afflicting the commerce and industry of our own and the other leading countries of the world.

ART. II.—*The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley.* Edited by H. BUXTON FORMAN. 4 vols. London: 1880.

POETRY is the natural expression of a frame and temperament like that of Shelley. Men of imaginative mind might fancy they saw in him a faun that had outlived the death of Pan, or a being who had wandered from another planet. His tall, slender, fragile form was the fitting tenement of his Ariel-like, elemental genius. His small head crowned with masses of brown curling hair, his feminine expressive features with the well-shaped graceful mouth and chin, the wild beauty of his star-like eyes, animated by ‘the latent lightnings of poetry,’ seemed to confirm the impression that he was a ‘frail exhalation’ robed in the golden beams of dawn, a spirit, as was said of him at Lerici, coming and going no one knew when or where, fit only for the rarefied atmosphere of intense emotion in which he lived. Even his shrill, discordant voice, though it grated unpleasantly on the ear, was not out of keeping with his high-strung nature, or with the ‘lyric cry’ of his poetry. Throughout his life he never lost the playful confidence of

mysterious brotherhood with which children draw dumb creatures to themselves. Nor were men who knew him more able to resist his power of attraction. Though to Hazlitt's eye Shelley looked like a fanatic, no one who came into close contact with him escaped the fascination of his personal charm.

Nor did he belie his appearance. In all his poetry it would be hard to find a prosaic idea or a prosaic expression. Obscurity is a charge so often alleged against him that it has become a commonplace of criticism. The haziness of his poetry is mainly the effect of his preference for visionary pictures of life. His language is lucid, except when his extreme facility lures him into negligence. The 'Cenci' affords abundant proof that his poetry is only obscure when his thoughts are indefinite. Whatever obscurity in truth exists is due to the fiery precipitance of his soul, the rapt frame of mind in which he wrote, the extreme novelty of his conceptions, the remoteness of his thoughts, the mystic exaltation of his ideas, the ardour of his temperament, the prodigality of his imagination. It is to causes like these, and not to poverty of resource, that we must attribute the incomplete and fragmentary character of his writings, his omissions and repetitions, his grammatical puzzles, and licenses of construction.

To him and his poetry may be applied truly and without metaphor, the terms of bard, inspiration, or divine frenzy. He is rarely a conscious artist; his whole being is concentrated in the message which he is constrained to deliver. He wrote under an overmastering impulse to which he surrendered himself heart and soul. He could not pause to find the right word, or to correct with care. Hence his text is full of blanks, alterations, and omissions. The continuity of his inspiration is remarkable. Even in revising a poem, the divine *afflatus* seems to rise once more and sweep him from his feet. Trelawney describes the 'Lines to a Lady with a Guitar' as 'a frightful scrawl, words smeared out with his finger, and one upon the other, over and over in tiers, and all run together in most admired disorder; it might have been taken for a sketch of a marsh overgrown with bulrushes, and the blots for wild ducks.'

Much of his poetry is a passionate dream, but such a dream as only visits poets. It strains the intellect while it fires the imagination. He does not so much seek to give the heart a tongue as to clothe spiritual aspirations, shadowy doubts, ethereal abstractions in a diaphanous robe of glitter-

ing verse. The depth and tenderness of his emotions seem to choke his utterance. Ever filled with unsatisfied longing, he soars, like his own skylark, higher yet and higher, into the astral region of the unconditioned, forgetting that his nest is on the earth. He does not strive to realise the ideal world, but rather idealises the actual world. Nature presents herself to him as the symbol of the vital forces which underlie her external phenomena; he sees in the mind only the mechanism by which it operates. It is these forces and powers which he personifies and endows with life. In painting nature he is prone rather to vitalise the spirit of the scene than to describe the objects before him.

His sensibilities are preternaturally acute. Heated to a white glow of passion by thoughts which might at the most kindle his fellows to a genial warmth, intoxicated by a draught of abstract sentiment that would not unseal the lips of other men, his genius seems unreal, because rapture lies so near the surface. The shadowy atmosphere is intensified by his habit of presenting the effect of impressions which to him were vivid, without even throwing on the wall the phantom shadows by which they were excited. His passion is ghostly because the result is seen without the explanation. His gaze is fixed on the past or the future; he is the poet of desire rather than of possession. Like his own wild-eyed charioteer, he pursues his fugitive thoughts, leaning forward with burning look, drinking the wind of his own speed, as if the thing he loved fled on before, and now, even now, he clasped it. Even his love of liberty, deep and sincere though it was, leaves a sense of unreality; it is not based on experience, but, in its cosmopolitan unselfishness, loses its hold on actual conditions, and becomes theoretical, visionary, and fanatical.

His poetic language is not seldom of that aerial gossamer-like texture which seems a fitter medium to reflect colours than to convey thought. His meaning was probably clear to himself; but, as he himself says, 'we cannot express our deepest thoughts; they are incomprehensible even to ourselves.' His shorter poems are exquisite specimens of intuitive verbal selection; often also, the facility is remarkable with which every remote analogy or abrupt suggestion that darted to the surface from some hidden depth of thought is caught and embodied in the perfection of words and of rhythmic form. Often again, in poems like the 'Cenci,' or 'Julian and Maddalo,' he shows a marvellous mastery of easy, forcible, and clear language. On the other hand, he

sometimes expresses himself in images but slightly connected, rather than in any more definite shape. These frequently impart his ideas in the most concise and luminous method, or burn his meaning into the brain; but they sometimes overlay the subject till all sense of solidity is destroyed. Especially is this true of a carnival of fancy, like the *Witch of Atlas*, which glows with gorgeous imagery of so disjointed and incongruous a character, that the records of a confused dream seem to be pursuing each other through the brain of the poet only to issue in a hurried dance of words.

Yet in spite of Shelley's appearance and temperament, in spite also of the essential character of his poetry, he was a master of prose composition. It was an article of Wordsworth's literary creed that all good poets write good prose. With the possible exception of Wordsworth himself, the saying is substantially true. Classic poets, like Mr. Arnold, in whom the instinct of form predominates, are naturally excellent writers of prose; but in a different sense the saying holds true of spontaneous poets, such as Shelley or Mr. Swinburne. Mr. Arnold, with that love of paradox which often impairs his critical faculty, doubts whether Shelley's 'delightful letters and essays, which deserve to be far more read than they are now, will not resist the wear and tear of time better, and finally come to stand higher, than his 'poetry.' Literally absurd as the statement is, it draws attention to a neglected fact. Shelley's prose preserves some of the distinctive features of his poetry. It is not the style of a man of the world, but of a man who is first and above all else a poet. Peacock, in his amusing portrait of Shelley as Scythrop in *Nightmare Abbey*, recognised the large substratum of wit and shrewd sense beneath the paradoxical and fanatical spirit which was fostered by his early aberrations and narrow surroundings. It is this side of his character which is brought out by his prose compositions. Shelley's passion for metaphysical speculation and dialectical discussion asserted itself early in his career, and disputed with poetry his exclusive allegiance. Even so late as 1819 he considered 'poetry very subordinate to moral and political science.' Those who know only Shelley the poet are sometimes surprised at his practical energy and the logical severity of his reasoning. In all his intellectual vagaries, his rare disinterestedness and sincerity is conspicuous. He gave up position and prospects for principles which he was convinced were right; he practised what he preached at heavy cost to himself. But it is often forgotten that, granting his pre-

misses, he thought and acted logically. It is the prose, rather than the poetry or the life, of Shelley that forms the main subject of the following pages.

Mr. Forman's indefatigable industry has gathered together in the four volumes before us all the important prose works of Shelley which are extant. These are for the first time presented in a collected form. The posthumous essays, letters, and fragments, which Mrs. Shelley issued in 1840, included none of the compositions which he published during his life. Both are incorporated in Mr. Forman's edition. The volumes also include a number of letters and fragments, some of which are new, while others have been collected from subsequent works written by Shelley's friends. No use is made of the letters contained in 'Hogg's Life,' or in the 'Shelley Memorials.' It is, in our opinion, greatly to be regretted that Mr. Forman has lost the opportunity of making the collection of letters as complete as possible. But with the exception of this possible defect, it is difficult to praise too highly the conscientious care which he has bestowed on the preparation of this handsome edition.

Shelley's prose works are of a most miscellaneous character. Mr. Forman has given them in chronological order, but here it will be more convenient to treat Shelley the prose-writer as a novelist, a social, political, and religious reformer, a translator, a critic, and a letter writer.

Shelley's first prose publications were his novels; 'Zastrozzi' was published in June 1810; 'St. Irvyne' in December of the same year. Besides these completed works, the fragment called 'The Assassins' was commenced in 1814 at Brunen after reading an account of the siege of Jerusalem. In 1819 he began a novel in the style of 'Corinne' of which he himself was to be the hero; but only a portion of 'The Coliseum' was finished. To the class of novels also belong the ghost stories told him at Geneva by M. G. Lewis. At the Monk's suggestion the whole party undertook to write unearthly tales; but the only results of the plan are Mrs. Shelley's 'Frankenstein' and Dr. Polidori's 'Vampyre.' As a child, Shelley's imagination ran riot among the moon-illuminated castles, cadaverous monks, scowling desperadoes, and obtrusive ghosts of Mrs. Radcliffe and the Minerva Press.

'While yet a boy I sought for ghosts, and sped
Thro' many a lonely chamber, cave and ruin,
And starlight wood, with fearful steps, pursuing
Hopes of high talk with the departed dead.'

He made the garret at Field Place the abode of an alchemist,

old, grey, and bearded. At home and at Eton he dabbled in chemistry and conjurations of the devil. Montoni, La Motte, and Schedoni were the first fictitious characters by which Shelley was impressed; he borrowed the name of Verezzi from one of Mrs. Radcliffe's actors. Godwin's influence also appears; the second title of 'St. Irvyne' is taken from his novel of 'St. Leon.' The German books which Shelley read in translations fostered his taste for the marvellous and romantic. Schiller's 'Robbers' and Burger's ballads took a powerful hold on his mind. Mr. Forman conjectures, on plausible, if not convincing, grounds, that 'Zastrozzi' and 'St. Irvyne' are translations from German originals. The novels of Charles Brockden Brown also impressed him deeply; he delighted in 'Edgar Huntley,' 'Arthur Mervyn,' and 'Wieland,' while Constantia Dudley in 'Ormond' struck him as the most exquisite character in fiction.

It was under these influences that Shelley began his career as an author. His novels are curiosities of literature of the melodramatic and blue-fire type. As works of art they are worthless imitations of the productions of the Minerva Press. Shelley's machinery consists of inquisitors, bandits, caverns, and other accoutrements from the property-room of Mrs. Radcliffe. The plots are wild and incoherent; the narrative is filled with stilted sentiment; the passions are unnatural; no delineation of character is attempted. Written in his boyhood, when his fancy was filled, like that of Scythrop, with dreams of 'Illuminati and Eleutherarchs,' his novels are marked by every fault of juvenile extravagance. The pomposity of his style is characteristic of youth; yet amid wastes of bathos and grandiose expression there occur passages which give promise of rich imagination, and are expressed with considerable eloquence. Even in the maturity of his poetic powers he failed in sustained narrative; in prose his failure was more certain and more conspicuous. The true interest of these juvenile novels consists in the light which they throw upon his temperament and his religious and moral opinions. The morbid tendency of his imagination is already marked. In these scenes of lurid ghastliness he sought that curdling of the soul, whether produced by the quiver of delight or the shudder of pain, which he craved as a stimulant. In his religious opinions he was still orthodox. Zastrozzi disbelieves in the immortality of the soul; but he is reproved for his doubts, and the fact seems only introduced to heighten the impression of his villany. It is startling to hear Verezzi declaring that love needs no

marriage ceremony. If Shelley had not recorded that he read the 'Nouvelle Héloïse' for the first time in 1816, we might fancy that 'Eloise in 'St. Irvyne' was modelled from Rousseau's heroine. 'Zastrozzi' is said to be based on the novel of 'Zofloya, the Moor.' Harriet Grove helped Shelley in its composition. 'St. Irvyne' is the more meaningless of the two completed novels; its title was taken from the name of a place near Horsham where Shelley walked by moonlight with his cousin and her brother. Perhaps the most remarkable circumstance connected with Shelley's novels is that he obtained forty pounds for 'Zastrozzi' from Messrs. Wilkie & Robinson of Paternoster Row. The following extract is from a letter addressed to Messrs. Longman in 1809, apparently with the intention of offering them 'Zastrozzi':—

'It is my intention to complete and publish a romance, of which I have already written a large portion, before the end of July. My object in writing is not pecuniary, as I am independent, being the heir of a gentleman of large fortune in the county of Sussex, and prosecuting my studies as an Oppidan at Eton. From the many leisure hours I have, I have taken an opportunity of indulging my favourite propensity in writing.' (Vol. iii. 329.)

Shelley's views on the political, social, and religious regeneration of the world were deeply coloured by the nature of the period when he wrote, by his enthusiastic character, by the influence of Godwin, and by his own philosophical and metaphysical theories.

He wrote at a period which was either tremulous with hope or soured by disappointment. Literature teems with new thoughts and opinions, destined to work unimagined changes in the social and political world. It was no ordinary revolution which stimulated his fancy, but one that shook to its foundations the existing fabric of society. The great drama was unfolding before his eyes. Everyday events were so wonderful that his imagination was kindled to a flame which spread like wildfire to every subject on which he touched. Many of those who had hailed with rapture the opening prospect recoiled with horror, like Coleridge or Wordsworth, when the promise seemed blasted by the Reign of Terror and the rise of Napoleon. Shelley, undaunted by the despondent gloom around him, continued to sing of 'kingless continents, sinless as Eden.' The golden future was still spread before his excited imagination. He attacks everything which seemed to delay his earthly Paradise with a force that at least leaves no doubt of his sincerity. He is

never merely fluent or rhetorical. The events of 1820 seemed to justify his hopes :—

The lightning of the nations, Liberty,
From heart to heart, from tower to tower, o'er Spain,
Scattering contagious fire into the sky,
Gleamed.

As the beacon light flashed from the Sierras to the Alps and the Adriatic, as Naples, Genoa, Piedmont, Massa, and finally his 'holy land' of Greece, raised the standard of revolt, Shelley gave utterance to his exultation in Odes of Orphic elevation which are masterpieces of lyric song.

No student of his poetry can doubt the depth and sincerity of Shelley's devotion to the cause of Liberty. His ardent love of abstract freedom was no transient feeling, but a principle of his life. Every thought by which he was guided was instinct with sympathy with his fellow men. He held and preached with fervent zeal an earnest faith in the intrinsic goodness of humanity. His enthusiasm was that of a religious missionary whose belief in his message is absolute. Trusting that creation even then groaned in the throes of a new birth, he threw himself heart and soul into the task of regenerating the world. No adventurous explorer was more daring, no starving alchemist more desperate than was Shelley in his efforts to solve the many riddles of life. But, unfortunately for himself and others, his instincts and his impulses were his only guide. Known rules did not fetter him : he brooked no compromise, ignored all limitations. He is too impetuous to be just ; his enthusiasm is too intense for sobriety, too perfervid for criticism. A passionate iconoclast with little constructive power, he conceived schemes which no man of experience could accept. Without misgiving or doubt, he looked forward to the day when man should become

' Sceptreless, free, uncircumscribed,
Equal, unclass'd, tribeless, and nationless,
Exempt from awe, worship, degree, the king
Over himself, just, gentle, wise ; but man.

In his poetry Shelley demands the destruction of all hindrances to the advent of this millennium, the abolition of government, the denial of all creeds, the removal of all restraint. He establishes in their place no sovereign power ; he calls, not for the imposition of just laws, but for the rejection of all law. Hence his political aspirations appear exceptionally vague and mystical. The politics of his prose

compositions are far more practical. He deals with realities. His ideal of political government is an ancient republic and Spartan virtue; but he does not forget that such a form of rule was as yet impracticable. In his poetry he wholly ignores national prejudices, human passions, social habits; but in his prose he takes them into consideration: he accepts government as a necessary discipline, recognises the need of training in habits of self-restraint, appreciates the danger of the sudden transfer of power to the masses.

Constituted as Shelley was, the influence of Godwin was peculiarly disastrous. It confined him to a narrow, conceited circle of doctrinaires who had no hold on the real needs of society; it encouraged his reliance on theory and contempt for realities; it gave his views an essentially un-English and cosmopolitan air. Exile and solitude served only to confirm his prejudices and strengthen his disregard of the opinions of others. At the present day it is difficult to realise the fascination which the author of 'Political Justice' exercised over his contemporaries; it is less hard to explain its source. Godwin was the friend of Holcroft and Paine, the host of the representatives of the revolutionary leaders of France, a member of the Revolutionist Club. He was no hero. His doctrines and his practice were inconsistent. A stoic, he accepted alms from his friends; a republican, he died the pensioner of monarchy. Like Price and Priestley, he began life as a Liberal Dissenter; he became a philosophic Radical. Precise, passionless, methodical, he was an uncompromising thinker. No experience of life modified his theories. Ticknor was struck by his 'great head, full of cold brains.' Like St. Just, or Victor Hugo's Cimourdain, he flies as an arrow to his mark. He grasps his point with singular pertinacity, treats his subject with remorseless logic, shrinks from no conclusion or consequence. His style is clear and forcible; he is said to have written one paragraph eight times before he was satisfied with its strength and perspicuity. Like Diderot he assumes the possibility of readjusting every social principle. Convinced of the perfectibility of mankind, he preached that optimism which is the religion of revolutions. Through the furnace of his new philosophy he passes the whole fabric of society. The cardinal principles of his system are the natural goodness of man, and the supremacy of the intellect over the passions. The fetters forged by kings and priests alone delayed the millennium of truth and justice. Set man free to attain perfection, and he will not make the attempt

only, but will succeed in the effort. If tradition, prescription, experience, custom, authority were erased from the tablet of the human mind, reason would reform the world. Utility he believes to be the only true morality; vice, an error of judgement; duty, a matter of arithmetic. Let argument supersede physical force, and coercion and restraint would speedily be recognised as unmixed evils, law as a tyrannical usurpation, the punishment of criminals as an insult to reason, marriage as an intolerable slavery, liberty of speech as a necessity, property as an injustice which sacrifices to individuals the greatest sum of general happiness. 'Political Justice' was the manifesto of a school.

In his early life Shelley adopted Godwin's doctrines in their entirety. Though they were always modified by his idealism, they never wholly lost their hold upon his mind. Shelley's philosophical theories are peculiarly difficult to follow, partly from his love of the indefinite, partly from the rapidity and number of the changes through which he passed, but above all from his habit of modifying or amalgamating the conceptions which he borrowed from others till they assumed an original shape. When Shelley wrote 'Queen Mab' he was, like Godwin, a Materialist in philosophy, and a Necessitarian in morals. He believed that men were incapable of resisting motives, that the moral and material universe is a chain of causes and effects, 'no one of which could occupy any other place than it does occupy, or act in any other way than it does act.' He hailed Necessity as the mother of the world. But he saw clearly the difficulty, which Godwin overlooked or ignored, of reconciling the moral reformer with the Necessitarian. He knew the need of some dynamic force by which to move the hearts of men. Like Godwin he held that vice could not coexist with freedom, and that the removal of all constraint would herald the return to primitive innocence. Though he overlooked the power of hereditary evil, his practical shrewdness led him to invoke some stronger power for its removal than logical principles of moral conduct, or the cold application of pure reason. He did not, like Rousseau, appeal to the human passions, but trusted to the divine contagion of 'beautiful idealisms of truth and justice.' It was the perception of the incongruity of Godwin's position that changed his philosophical views. As his intellect matured he swung completely round. He came to believe that man is no passive instrument in the hands of Necessity, but has within him a divine power, a will which may transform his nature,

and make him 'all we dream of, happy, high, majestic.' He still advocated the complete readjustment of society, because he believed that all existing institutions tend to depress and pervert the will. This belief appears not only in 'Julian and Maddalo' where it might be put forward 'to meet Byron's Calvinism, but pervades the whole of his poetry.

Nor was his attitude towards society affected by his idealism. Though the spirit of Nature appeared to him as a vital mind and no longer as a blind Necessity, though thought, not matter, became the reality of his universe, it still remained a part of his creed that to defeat the 'Python 'Faith,' to unseat 'grey Power from her ancestral throne,' to destroy the 'Anarch Custom' was to usher in the Earthly Paradise. He was a transcendental evolutionist. Creation presented to him the aspect of a perpetual struggle to realise an ever-advancing ideal. Custom bars the way of progress. Mankind is emancipated whenever human reason, linked with faith and love, overthrows the tyranny of inertness. Again the world seemed to him the accumulation of past thought, a conglomeration of traditions, a drift, as it were, of opinions. This incumbent mass fetters the free play of the human intellect. New thoughts, fashioned by the imagination of the poet, loosen, disintegrate, rend, and dislodge this superimposed weight. Thus poets are 'the 'acknowledged legislators of the world;' to them belongs the high office of regenerating mankind. This is the theory which Shelley meant to develop in his 'Defence of Poetry.' In the present context it is sufficient to point out that his effort to refashion the world proceeded not from a presumptuous self-confidence, but from intense faith in what he believed to be a sacred mission.

To defend Shelley's political and social theories would be a hopeless task. But some misconceptions exist as to the nature of his opinions which may possibly be removed. It is popularly supposed that Shelley was a hare-brained enthusiast, who commenced to reform the world by studiously ignoring contemporary politics. This view of Shelley's character is based partly on his poetry, partly on his 'Life' by Hogg. Hogg states that no newspaper ever found its way into Shelley's room during his residence at Oxford. Hogg himself refutes his own statement by previously including a bundle of newspapers among the contents of Shelley's room at University College. The statement might be abundantly disproved from other sources. Innumerable

passages occur in Shelley's letters in which he asks for papers and pamphlets. Nor was this sympathy a growth of his later years. At Oxford he showed the keenest interest in public events of the day, devoured political pamphlets, himself engaged in newspaper warfare. In 1811, while still an undergraduate, he seems to have addressed a circular to the Liberal papers proposing to form a League to secure the freedom of the Press. The immediate occasion was the prosecution of 'The Statesman,' Lord Ellenborough's sentence of Daniel Lovel to five years' imprisonment, and the imprisonment of Peter Finnerty for a libel on Lord Castlereagh in connexion with the Walcheren Expedition. He subscribed to a fund raised for Finnerty's defence, and wrote a 'Poetical Essay 'on the Existing State of Things,' the profits of which, amounting to 100*l.*, were contributed to his support in Lincoln gaol.

This poem is not without bearing on his Irish campaign, which is often quoted to illustrate the wild projects of his passing freaks. Shelley's advocacy of Irish grievances was no sudden whim. The 'Posthumous Fragments of Margaret 'Nicholson,' which he published in 1810, show that he already sympathised with Ireland; he makes the moral hero of 'St. Irvyne' an Irishman; the quotation from Southey which Shelley prefixed to the 'Poetical Essay on the Existing State of Things,' as well as the object of the poem, prove that he was already interested in Irish wrongs. In October 1811 he writes from the Lakes: 'Southey hates 'the Irish; he speaks against Catholic Emancipation. Our 'differences were the subject of a long conversation.' No doubt his project of a visit to Dublin in February 1812 was hastily conceived and suddenly executed; but the facts on which his determination was based had long occupied his mind. Foolish though the campaign undoubtedly was, it rather gives a proof of his practical energy than of his capricious instability.

Shelley was not in 1812 convinced that the world could be regenerated by 'beautiful idealisms' of moral excellence. Nor was he satisfied with the slow results which might be expected from Godwin's reasoning. He determined to do something himself to diffuse happiness and ameliorate social conditions. Dublin was the scene of his labours. His object was to cement a patriotic alliance of all religious sects for the emancipation of the Catholics and the Repeal of Union. For this purpose he wrote and distributed pamphlets; but neither the 'Address to the Irish People,' nor the 'Proposals

'for an Association' are spirit-stirring productions; they are juvenile and commonplace. As rhetorical efforts they fail to rouse, and logical conviction is not attempted. The 'Declaration of Rights' is a more noteworthy production. It is an epigrammatic code of democratic politics, full of pregnant apothegms, contrasting favourably with the Declaration of the Constituent Assembly and of Robespierre. In one important point Shelley showed his independence and practical ability. Godwin deprecated associations of all kinds; co-operation seemed to him an invasion of the principle of individualism. Yet it was by an association similar to that which Shelley proposed that Catholic Emancipation was eventually carried. On the other hand, Shelley was wholly blind to the danger of inviting masses, whom he describes as 'hardly higher in the scale of intellectual being' than the oyster, to reform the world by the light of pure reason. He himself consistently and earnestly advocated non-resistance. There is in him no trace of the inflammatory demagogue. In the 'Declaration of Rights' he says:—

'No man has a right to disturb the public peace by personally resisting the execution of a law, however bad. He ought to acquiesce, using at the same time the utmost powers of his reason to promote its repeal.'

So again in the 'Address to the Irish People':—

'If you are convinced of the truth of your cause, trust wholly to its truth; if you are not convinced, give it up. In no case employ violence; the way to liberty and happiness is never to transgress the rules of virtue and justice. . . . Associations for purposes of violence are entitled to the strongest disapprobation of the real reformist. Always suspect that some knavish rascal is at the bottom of things of this kind, waiting to profit by the confusion. All secret associations are also bad. Hidden arms, secret meetings and designs violently to separate England from Ireland are all very bad.'

This detestation of violence runs through all his political writings, whether in prose or poetry. By meek submission Cythna melted the heart of the executioner; revenge was the moral flaw which made Beatrice a tragic character; both in 'Queen Mab' and in 'Prometheus Unbound' the rage of man against his oppressors gives place to compassion: Prometheus revokes his curse on Jove. In the 'Masque of Anarchy' Shelley exhorts the industrial classes to stand

'Calm and resolute,
Like a forest close and mute,
With folded arms and looks which are
Weapons of an unvanquished war.'

So again in the 'Ode to the Assertors of Liberty':—

'But let not the pansy among them be,
Ye were injured, and that means memory.'

The one exception is contained in a letter written in 1820 under the stimulus of strong excitement:—

'At Naples, the Constitutional party have declared to the Austrian Minister that, if the Emperor should make war on them, their first action would be to put to death all the members of the royal family—a necessary and most just measure where the forces of the combatants as well as the merits of their respective causes are so unequal.'

Shelley undoubtedly underrated the inflammable character of an Irish mob. On this point Godwin pleaded earnestly and sensibly with Shelley. Whether Shelley was convinced by his arguments, or yielded to his authority, or was alarmed by the violence of his own adherents, is uncertain; but after a few weeks he suppressed his pamphlets and left Dublin.

Like Catholic Emancipation, many of Shelley's proposed reforms, for which seventy years ago he was scouted by society, have been either carried or accepted as open to discussion. In 1812 the freedom of the Press was jealously restricted. Shelley was throughout his life a consistent advocate of the rights of public discussion. His letter to Lord Ellenborough, written in 1812, is the first of his prose publications which possesses any remarkable merit. The occasion of its publication was the condemnation of Eaton for publishing the third part of Paine's 'Age of Reason.' It has none of the stateliness and richness of Milton's 'Areo-pagitica,' but it is a forcible and eloquent composition. In it he repeats the principles which he had enforced in his Irish address:

'It is ever a proof that the falsehood of a proposition is felt by those who use power and coercion, not reasoning and persuasion, to procure its admission. . . . Falsehood skulks in holes and corners, "It lets I dare not wait upon I would, like the poor cat in the adage," except when it has power, and then, as it was a coward, it is a tyrant.'

Shelley has been called an apostle of toleration. It would be more true to say that he was a determined foe to intolerance.

'The time,' he concludes, 'is rapidly approaching, I hope, that you, my lord, may live to behold its arrival, when the Mahometan, the Jew, the Christian, the Deist, and the Atheist will live together in one community, equally sharing the benefits which arise from its association, and united in the bonds of charity and brotherly love.' (Vol. i. pp. 423, 424.)

War he attacked as the statesman's game. He fought against the inequality of the sexes, and maintained the rights of women to participate in the profits of their labour. 'Can man,' he asks, 'be free if woman be a slave?' He assailed the vicious system of the Poor Law, by which the agricultural classes were degraded. Tender-hearted towards every living creature, he argued in the name of humanity against capital punishment, then inflicted for petty thefts. No Acts at that time existed to protect life and health in mines or factories, or to guard the interests of children and women hands. It was on behalf of these industrial classes, the helots of luxury, that he wrote the 'Address to the 'People on the Death of Princess Charlotte.' The Princess died on November 6, 1817; on the following day three of the leaders in the late riots, Brandreth, Ludlam, and Turner, were executed for high treason. The pamphlet is headed 'We pity the plumage, but forget the dying bird.' Mr. Forman accepts the suggestion of Mr. MacCarthy that Shelley borrowed the quotation from the 'Reflector.' It also occurs in Paine's retort to Burke's splendid passage on the death of Marie Antoinette. Familiar as Shelley was with Paine's works, it seems more probable that this was the source of the quotation. Shelley makes no defence for the condemned men; he accepts the punishment of their violence as just and necessary. His fiery indignation is stirred by the conduct of the Government spies who were dispersed among the famished and illiterate labourers, and were suspected of instigating the outrages they denounced. Even on the scaffold two of the prisoners attributed their fate to Oliver, the most notorious of the informers. The remedy which Shelley advocates is an enlarged representation. On this subject he wrote in the same year a pamphlet entitled 'A 'Proposal for putting Reform to the Vote.' Under the pseudonym of 'The Hermit of Marlow' he puts forward a plan by which the entire adult male population could register their opinions on the question 'whether the nation desires a 'reform in Parliament or no.' He offers 100*l.* towards the expense of taking this national poll. He concludes by stating his own opinions on the subject of parliamentary reform. 'Annual Parliaments,' he says, 'have my entire assent.' On this point he agreed with Cobbett; on the franchise question he differed from Paine and Cartwright:—

'With respect to Universal Suffrage, I confess I consider its adoption, in the present unprepared state of public knowledge and feeling, a measure fraught with peril. I think that none but those

who register their names as paying a certain small sum in *direct taxes* ought, at present, to send members to Parliament. . . . Nothing can less consist with reason . . . than the plan which should abolish the regal and aristocratical branches of our constitution, before the public mind, through many gradations of improvement, shall have arrived at the maturity which can disregard these symbols of its childhood.' (Vol. ii. p. 95.)

Shelley's views of marriage cannot be overlooked in a discussion of his social theories. Like Godwin, he held that the marriage-tie ought only to be binding so long as love existed between husband and wife. If two persons love, the ceremony of marriage is unnecessary; if they do not, it is immoral. He urged this theory not for his own gratification, for, except in one signal instance, his generosity, his contempt for meanness, his lofty moral aspirations, kept him singularly free from vicious actions. He believed that the abolition of the marriage contract would raise the position of women. Assuming, as he did, that man's natural goodness was perverted by custom, he thought that, without legal constraint, the union of man and woman would be permanent as well as more generous and devoted. He forgot that marriage like other social institutions was established as a protection against individual selfishness. Yet in his prose writings he admitted that existing society must necessarily reject his theories. He therefore twice submitted to a ceremony which he hoped would one day become obsolete. His poetry has often led to misconception of his principles. His choice of incest as the motive-power in 'Laon and Cythna,' and his recurrence to the same subject both in 'Rosalind and Helen' and the 'Cenci,' fostered a belief in his moral depravity. But without defending Shelley's taste, the subject of 'Laon and Cythna' was not chosen in an elvish spirit of defiance to society. Shelley believed that morality has two elements, the natural and the artificial. The undue preponderance which society assigns to the artificial elements depraves the primitive impulses. He chose the most extreme illustration he could find in order to startle society from those customary prejudices which he believed to be the perversion of natural morality. Another fruitful source of misconception is his passionate language on the subject of ideal love. Both in his poetry and in the prose essay on love, his views are coloured by an imperfect Platonism. With Plato he believed that love is the first initiation into the heavenly mysteries. Love passes from the love of one form to the love of all forms that are beautiful, thence to

beauty as it is imaged in the soul, in habits, institutions, doctrines, and finally to the contemplation of the supreme archetypal beauty itself. But Shelley also held the theory that each human soul has its complement on this earth with which it seeks to be united. Out of these two theories he frames his own peculiar conception. He seems to believe that the supreme absolute archetypal beauty is embodied in the complement of his own soul. He thus blends his mystical passion with his earthly affections. It is this union of the abstract and the concrete, the ideal and the real, the personal and the impersonal, which lifts 'Epipsychidion' out of the arctic circle of cold philosophy into the tropical zone of passionate poetry. He differs from Plato in finding this ideal of universal beauty personified in a human form like that of Emilia Viviani.

The personal element runs through all Shelley's poetry of ideal love. An earth-born Emilia is the waking vision of Alastor's dream, Asia in womanhood, the power unseen of intellectual beauty embodied in mortal form, Cythna vitalised, the Venus Urania of Prince Athanase, Queen Mab and the Witch of Atlas incarnated. The Spirit of Beauty mediates between the central source of being and the mind of man; in her transient visits she inspires man with all that is good and great within him. Without her the world would be a vacant solitude—a grey and lampless void. Whatever name be given to this spiritual influence, her visitations are the moments when man gains a glimpse of higher life. The exquisite prose fragment on the subjects of love gives a touching picture of Shelley's craving for sympathy, his disappointment, and his solace in communion with Nature:—

'What is Love? Ask him who lives what is life; ask him who adores what is God?

'I know not the internal constitution of other men, not even thine, whom I now address. I see that in some external attributes they resemble me, but when, misled by that appearance, I have thought to appeal to something in common, and unburthen my inmost soul to them, I have found my language misunderstood, like one in a distant and savage land. The more opportunities they have afforded me for experience, the wider has appeared the interval between us, and to a greater distance have the points of sympathy been withdrawn. With a spirit ill fitted to sustain such proof, trembling and feeble through its tenderness, I have everywhere sought sympathy, and have found only repulse and disappointment.

'*Thou demandest what is Love.* It is that powerful attraction towards all we conceive, or fear, or hope beyond ourselves, when we

find within our own thoughts the chasm of an insufficient void, and seek to awaken in all things that are, a community with what we experience within ourselves. If we reason, we would be understood; if we imagine, we would that the airy children of our brains were born anew within another's; if we feel, we would that another's nerves should vibrate to our own, that the beams of their eyes should kindle at once and mix and melt into our own; that lips of motionless ice should not reply to lips burning and quivering with the heart's best blood. This is Love. . . . We are born into the world, and there is something within us which, from the instant that we live, more and more thirsts after its likeness. . . . The discovery of its antitype . . . is the invisible and unattainable point to which Love tends; and to attain which, it urges forth the powers of man to arrest the faintest shadow of that, without the possession of which there is no rest nor respite to the heart over which it rules. Hence in solitude, or in that deserted state when we are surrounded by human beings, and yet they sympathise not with us, we love the flowers, the grass, the waters, and the sky. In the motion of the very leaves of spring, in the blue air, there is then found a secret correspondence with our heart. There is eloquence in the tongueless wind, and a melody in the flowing brooks and the rustling of the reeds beside them, which, by their inconceivable relation to something within the soul, awaken the spirits to a dance of breathless rapture, and bring tears of mysterious tenderness to the eyes, like the enthusiasm of patriotic success, or the voice of one beloved singing to you alone.' (Vol. ii. pp. 269, 270.)

At one period of Shelley's career the world seemed to him, as to Wordsworth, animated by thought; in his later years it was vitalised by love. Shelley gave to love a noble and almost apostolic meaning. Love meant to him his own identification with all that is beautiful in the thoughts and actions of others, the impulse to put himself in the place of another and of many others, to make the pains and the pleasures of humanity his own. Love became the motive of his conduct, the law of his morality, the keystone of his social and political theories. He laboured to make it the only perfect law of liberty and the living principle of progress. With enthusiastic confidence he looked forward to the day when love should rule the universe. His own life was a dream of enthusiastic philanthropy, in which he practically exemplified his conception of the meaning of the word by self-denying sympathy with suffering and distress.

The following passage from the 'Coliseum' is a beautiful exposition of his hopes—

'The internal nature of each being is surrounded by a circle, not to be surmounted by his fellows; and it is this repulsion which constitutes the misfortune of the condition of life. But there is a circle which comprehends, as well as one which mutually excludes, all things

which feel. And, with respect to man, his public and his private happiness consists in diminishing the circumference which includes those resembling himself, until they become one with him, and he with them. It is because we enter into the meditations, designs, and destinies of something beyond ourselves, that the contemplation of the ruins of human power excites an elevating sense of awfulness and beauty. It is therefore that the ocean, the glacier, the cataract, the tempest, the volcano, have each a spirit which animates the extremities of our frame with tingling joy. It is therefore that the singing of birds, and the motion of leaves, the sensation of the odorous earth beneath, and the freshness of the living wind around, is sweet. And this is Love. This is the religion of eternity, whose votaries have been exiled from among the multitude of mankind. "O Power!" cried the old man, lifting his sightless eyes towards the undazzling sun, "thou which interpenetrates all things, and without which this glorious world were a blind and formless chaos, Love, Author of Good, God, King, Father! Friend of these thy worshippers! Two solitary hearts invoke thee, may they be divided never! If the contentions of mankind have been their misery; if to give and seek that happiness which thou art, has been their choice and destiny; if, in the contemplation of these majestic records of the power of their kind, they see the shadow and the prophecy of that which thou mayst have decreed that he should become; if the justice, the liberty, the loveliness, the truth, which are thy footsteps, have been sought by them, divide them not! It is thine to unite, to eternise; to make outlive the limits of the grave those who have left among the living, memorials of thee." (Vol. iii. pp. 36, 37.)

Love is the epitome of Shelley's religion. On religious subjects Shelley's prose writings must be read with caution. They sum up the rational basis of his beliefs, but they do not represent the atmosphere of faith which he habitually breathed. Towards creeds he placed himself in the attitude not of an atheist but of an agnostic. Vehemently opposed to the vulgar conception of God as an autocratic tyrant, he revolted from the gross anthropomorphism of theologians. Still more fiercely did he reject theories of God's dealings with men which imputed to Him, in virtue of His omnipotence, designs and motives that outrage the universal principles of justice and mercy and love. Dogmas on matters which elude intellectual presentation were his abhorrence. No reasoning, he contended, could prove the existence of God. Religious truth can never be apprehended by the senses, but lies outside the sphere of positive knowledge and is conveyed by different channels. The ultimate appeal lies to the inner consciousness of men, the innate beliefs which are implanted in the human heart. He insisted on the impossibility of knowing the unknowable, but he nowhere attempts to demonstrate the non-existence of the Deity.

He refused to affect certainty where he found only mystery. Much of the obloquy which he incurred was due to the mortification of those whose feelings on such topics had outstripped their understanding. It is on this failure of proof that he strenuously insists in the celebrated tract on the 'Necessity of Atheism,' which procured his expulsion from the University of Oxford. Even in 'Queen Mab' he denies not a regulative but a creative deity. The deepest truths are imageless and lie beyond the sphere of our consciousness. But behind the phenomenal world he recognised an essential power which he there calls the Spirit of Necessity, and which, in later poems, he addresses as the omnipresent Mind, or the all-pervading Spirit of Love.

As a boy his restless search for truth made him a sceptic in a variety of subjects. Intellectual impertinence cannot be imputed to him. But his curiosity overpowered that sense of awe which stands as a sentinel at the gate of heaven to guard its sanctities. 'Natural piety' belonged to his character, but he treated reverence as the synonym of superstition. Whether it was the barrier between mind and matter, nature and spirit, or the veil of mystery which shrouds the faces of life and death, he was irresistibly impelled to pierce the one or raise the other. In his youth he became a Materialist of the French School. But this was but a passing phase of thought. In the prose fragment on 'Life' he calls materialism

'a seducing system to young and superficial minds. It allows its disciples to talk, and dispenses them from thinking. But I was discontented with such a view of things as it afforded; man is a being of high aspirations, "looking both before and after," "whose thoughts "wander through eternity," disclaiming alliance with transience and decay; incapable of imagining to himself annihilation; existing but in the future and the past; being, not what he is, but what he has been and shall be. Whatever may be his true and final destination, there is a spirit within him at enmity with "nothingness and dissolution."' (Vol. ii. pp. 259, 260.)

In his maturer years he became a Berkeleyan Immaterialist and a Pantheist. In 'Queen Mab' necessity swayed the world; in 'Prometheus Unbound' and 'Adonais' the sovereign ruler of the Universe is the Spirit of Love. Both 'Queen Mab' and 'Prometheus' represent the consummation of human perfection. But in 'Queen Mab' he celebrates the instinctive union with the ideal to which man is prompted by primitive desires; he is without sin from ignorance. In 'Prometheus Unbound' he describes the conformity with

the ideal which proceeds not from impulse but from rational and self-conscious motives; man is virtuous from wisdom. So again, if as a youth Shelley found God nowhere, he ended by finding Him everywhere. His Hellenic mind, intellectual not emotional, abstract not concrete, naturally tended to Pantheism. Everything was God, and God was everything; but he would not call the all-pervading spirit God, or give it personality. Spirits emanating from it lived and dreamed in valley and hill, forest and fountain; it filled the air with all that was sweet in sound, or pure in vision; nor is it contained in nature, but transcends and kindles the universe. God has given, it is said, two books for the instruction of mankind, the book of revelation and the book of nature. Few have read the latter with greater profit than Shelley.

Shelley has no one but himself to blame for his atheistical reputation, yet his atheism was the short mental phase of a crude and boyish thinker which lasted for the briefest possible interval. He inscribed the word *atheos* as an appendage to his name in the visitors' book at Montanvert, and everywhere paraded his unorthodox opinions. He used the word, so he told Trelawney, 'to express my abhorrence of superstition. I took up the word, as a knight took up a gauntlet, in defiance of injustice.' Mr. Browning believed that, had Shelley lived, he would have become a Christian. No doubt his conception of the universe and creation approximated more and more towards the Christian theory, but we see no real confirmation of the hope either in his poetry or his prose. He yearned for union with the mysterious Being whose quickening influence he discerned in the universe, with the God of his own imagination whom he called the Spirit of Nature, Love, or Beauty. But the theological theory of the Fall and Redemption of Mankind and the idea of sacrifice for sin would have fatally impeded his acceptance of Christ as the incarnation of this spirit, as Divine love embodied in human form. The Bible was a book which he read and re-read; yet his acquaintance with the system of Christian ethics was superficial. He saw in Christianity nothing but its materialism and its history. In its broader features it repelled him by its apparent injustice. When Shelley lived, theology was intensely pessimist. Man was a creature justly doomed to eternal damnation on account of sins for which he was not morally responsible. Shelley himself believed that the origin of evil was the result of custom, institutions, and creeds. He trusted that evil could be expelled from human nature by an effort of the

will. No sense of personal sin oppressed him; he was haunted by no perception of the need of redemption. Shelley treated Christ the Son of God with entire disbelief. The passages in which his views are expressed need not be quoted. Doubtless it was the mediæval aspect of Christianity which Shelley principally assailed; but none of his writings indicate the slightest disposition to accept the divinity of Christ. Towards Christ as man he preserved an attitude of the deepest love and reverence. He connected him with Prometheus, as in the passage in which he describes

‘ Drops of bloody agony flow
From his white and quivering brow.’

He intended to write a Life of Christ in order to revoke his hasty note to Queen Mab that ‘ Jesus was an ambitious man ‘ who aspired to the throne of Judæa.’ The plan was never carried out, but the ‘ Essay on Christianity,’ from which the following tribute to the character of Christ is extracted, was probably the outcome of the project. ‘ His biographers,’ he writes,

‘ have left sufficiently clear indications of the genuine character of Jesus Christ to rescue it for ever from the imputations cast upon it by their ignorance and fanaticism. We discover that he is the enemy of oppression and falsehood; that he is the advocate of equal justice; that he is neither disposed to sanction bloodshed nor deceit, under whatsoever pretence their practices may be indicated. We discover that he was a man of meek and majestic demeanour, calm in danger; of natural and simple thought and habits; beloved to adoration by his adherents; unmoved, solemn, and severe.’ (Vol. ii. p. 356.)

It is difficult to affirm positively what were Shelley’s views on the existence and nature of a Deity or on the immortality of the soul. Mrs. Shelley states that Shelley was ‘ a disciple ‘ of the immaterial philosophy of Berkeley.’ The truth is, perhaps, too broadly stated. Shelley first began to read Berkeley in 1812, at the suggestion of Southey. He accepted the Bishop’s argument that the non-existence of matter may be demonstrated; but there is no proof that he acceded to the argument founded on the existence of God by which Berkeley concluded that matter cannot be proved to be more than a perception of the mind. Shelley never believed in a creative Deity, though he undoubtedly perceived in the universe an omnipresent all-pervading regulating spirit. His God was coeval with creation, but not an intelligent First Cause. He held that there was one universal eternal Mind by which his own mind was informed, and the sum of whose

perceptions is all that is comprised in the material universe. But it seemed to him highly improbable that the cause of mind is similar to mind. The unknown realms of interminable forms of thought which this intellectual philosophy opened to his imagination were as infinite as they were mysterious and majestic. But that which principally attracted him to the theory was the unity and grandeur which it gave to his ideas. In the prose fragment on 'Life' he says,

'The view of life presented by the most refined deductions of the intellectual philosophy, is that of unity. Nothing exists but as it is perceived. The difference is merely nominal between those two classes of thought, which are vulgarly distinguished by the names of ideas of external objects. Pursuing the same thread of reasoning, the existence of distinct individual minds, similar to that which is employed in now questioning its own nature, is likewise found to be a delusion. The words *I, you, they*, are not signs of any actual difference subsisting between the assemblage of thoughts thus indicated, but are merely marks employed to denote the different modifications of the one mind.' (Vol. ii. p. 262.)

This philosophical view obscures his opinions on the subject of Immortality. In his essay 'On a Future State' he concludes that, without the aid of theological revelation, future life cannot be proved. But he is there arguing the logical pros and cons of immortality, and the conclusion represents logical results, not matters of faith. His theory of the universal Mind rendered it impossible for him to believe in the annihilation of the mind or soul. His own soul was but an atom of immensity, a part of the universal soul which was coeternal with the material universe. In death the separate soul of Shelley returns to the great whole of which it was a unit. Death is therefore but the fading of the night of life, the dawn of the true ideal existence.

'Death is the veil which those who live call life;
They sleep, and it is lifted.'

What life is, is known only to the uncommunicating dead: mortal life is truly death; but what we call death is the awakening of the spirit's eternal life. Here Shelley probably stopped. He did not ask himself whether each individual soul is an indestructible, immortal unit. He believed in fusion with the eternal Mind, a return to the fount of eternal being—

'Die—if thou wouldst be with that which thou dost seek,'
yet it is plain from the 'Essay on a Future State' that to

Shelley man's hope of individual immortality appeared a sure indication of the truth of that secret persuasion. He himself longed to be able to own

‘That death itself must be,
Like all the rest, a mockery.’

In his notes to ‘Hellas’ he says ‘the inextinguishable thirst for immortality’ is ‘the strongest and the only presumption that eternity is the inheritance of every thinking being.’ In his poetry his imagination overpowers his logic. ‘Far in the unapparent’ shone ‘forms robed in dazzling immortality,’ and among them

‘The soul of Adonais, like a star,
Beacons from the abode where the Eternal are.’

The signs of Shelley's nascent orthodoxy are few, faint, and indistinct. But his youth, the gradual development of his mind, and the beauty of his character, deserve to be considered in estimating the real prospects of his eventually embracing Christianity. Like Byron he rebelled against the conventionalities of religion; but no cold sneers against virtue ever polluted his lips. He was more of a Christian than he himself knew. He said that he had rather be damned with Plato and Bacon than go to heaven with Paley and Malthus. But Coleridge was right when he said that Shelley's so-called atheism was the next best religion to Christianity. An earnest seeker after truth, overflowing with sympathy both for man and beast, as fearless morally as he was physically, animated by the loftiest enthusiasms, Shelley taught his fellows, as few others have attempted to teach, to love their neighbours as themselves, to help the needy, and relieve the sick. Those who know anything of the details of his life will readily recall his habitual practice of his own precepts, his untiring efforts to alleviate suffering, his self-denial and temperance which alone rendered possible his open-handed charity. Nor was his the lavish generosity of a man too indolent to be just. He personally inquired into the circumstances of his pensioners. ‘He had,’ wrote Byron, ‘formed to himself a *beau idéal* of all that is fine, high-minded, and noble, and he acted up to this ideal to the very letter.’

Shelley's great religious teacher was Plato: to the Greek philosopher he owed more than to any other writer ancient or modern. It is an instructive commentary on the dissatisfied tone of his mind that even Plato is chained to the triumphal car of life among ‘the mighty phantoms of

'an elder day.' Shelley was fascinated by the union of poetry and philosophy which he found in Plato; some portion of the debt he repaid by one of the finest translations in English prose; yet with characteristic independence he was not consistent even in his Platonism. His poetry is full of half suggestions of Plato which appear to be borrowed, and yet are so modified as to wear the garb of originality. For this reason it is impossible to estimate the exact amount of his obligations. Under Dr. Lind, the wise Zonaras of his Eton schooldays, Shelley first read

'The story of the feast,
And Agathon and Diotima seemed
From death and dark forgetfulness released.'

It was the 'Phædo' which first shook his faith in materialism; to 'Adonais,' which contains his most explicit utterances on immortality, is prefixed a quotation from Plato. From Plato Shelley borrowed his idealism. While Keats aims at describing the beauty of Nature, Shelley strives to convey its spirit, its essence, and elemental truth. Yet Shelley imbibed none of Plato's repose which found rest in the earth because it was full of divine analogies. Another Platonic theory which at one time he embraced with characteristic impetuosity was pre-existence. All knowledge Shelley derived from reminiscence. This 'ante-natal life,' of which he makes Rousseau speak, added in his eyes a new charm to childhood. But the speechlessness of infancy baffled all his inquiries by silence. 'How provokingly close,' he exclaimed, 'are these new-born babes.' From Plato again, as we have seen, he borrowed his theory of Love for the Idea of Beauty; but, unlike his master, he amalgamated it with another Platonic suggestion that each soul seeks to be united with that other soul which is created to be its complement. Hence he found his supreme ideal embodied in earthly forms, and slips from love of a cold abstraction into personal passion. Only in the Hymn to Intellectual Beauty is the Platonic doctrine kept clear from earthly stain.

His translations from Plato, like his poetic versions of classic or modern poets, are not remarkable for accuracy. But they succeed to an extraordinary extent in embodying the spirit of the original in an English shape. The 'Symposium' was translated in six days in 1818 at a time when, from ill health and mental anxiety, he felt incapable of original work. To it he intended to prefix an 'Essay on the Manners of the Ancients relative to the Subject of

‘Love.’ Only a portion of the essay was completed. The following extract from the ‘Symposium’ contains the peroration of Agathon’s speech in praise of Love, a speech which Shelley considered to be more beautiful than anything ever written, with the possible exception of the speech of Henrietta to Mandeville in Godwin’s novel :—

‘Yes, Love, who showers benignity upon the world, and before whose presence all harsh passions flee and perish; the author of all soft affections; merciful, mild; the object of the admiration of the wise, and the delight of gods; possessed by the fortunate and desired by the unhappy, therefore unhappy because they possess him not; the father of grace, and delicacy, and gentleness, and delight, and persuasion, and desire; the cherisher of all that is good, the abolisher of all evil; our most excellent pilot, defence, saviour and guardian in labour and in fear, in desire and in reason; the ornament and governor of all things human and divine; the best, the loveliest; in whose footsteps everyone ought to follow, celebrating him excellently in song, and bearing each his part in that divinest harmony which Love sings to all things which live and are, soothing the troubled minds of gods and men. This, O Phædrus, is what I have to offer in praise of the divinity, partly composed, indeed, of thoughtless and playful fancies, and partly of such serious ones as I could well command.’ (Vol. iii. p. 199.)

Still more interesting in the light which it throws on Shelley’s Platonism is Diotima’s speech. Here is presented the pure Platonic conception of Love, though the whole passage is too long for quotation :—

‘He who aspires to love rightly, ought from his earliest youth to seek an intercourse with beautiful forms, and first to make a single form the object of his love, and therein to generate intellectual excellencies. He ought, then, to consider that beauty in whatever form it resides is the brother of that beauty which subsists in another form: and if he ought to pursue that which is beautiful in form it would be absurd to imagine that beauty is not one and the same thing in all forms, and would therefore remit much of his ardent preference towards one, through his perception of the multitude of claims upon his love. In addition, he would consider the beauty which is in souls more excellent than that which is in form. So that one endowed with an admirable soul, even though the flower of the form was withered, would suffice him as the object of his love and care, and the companion with whom he might seek and produce such conclusions as tend to the improvement of youth; so that it might be led to observe the beauty and the conformity which there is in the observation of its duties and the laws, and to esteem little the mere beauty of the outward form. He would then conduct his pupil to science, so that he might look upon the loveliness of wisdom; and that contemplating thus the universal beauty, no longer would he unworthily and meanly enslave himself to the attractions of one form in love, nor one subject of

discipline or science, but would turn towards the wide ocean of intellectual beauty, and from the sight of the lovely and majestic forms which it contains, would abundantly bring forth his conceptions in philosophy: until, strengthened and confirmed, he should at length steadily contemplate one science, which is the science of this universal beauty.' (Vol. iii. pp. 219, 220.)

It only remains to speak of Shelley as a critic and a letter writer. But few literary criticisms are contained in his prose works. There are fragmentary notices of Godwin's 'Mandeville,' Peacock's 'Rododaphne,' Mrs. Shelley's 'Frankenstein.' In comparing himself with other writers his judgement was biassed by his innate modesty and by the generosity of his admiration; but in estimating his own merits he clearly perceived the sources of his strength and weakness. Of Keats he had a high opinion: 'If "Hyperion,"' he says, 'be not grand poetry, none has been produced by 'our contemporaries.' At the same time he acknowledges the defects of 'Endymion,' and did not value highly any of Keats' other poems, except the 'Eve of St. Agnes' and 'Isabella.' Diffident of his genius in the presence of others, he thoroughly knew the secret of his own strength. His powers consist, as he wrote to Godwin in 1818,

'in sympathy and that part of the imagination which relates to sentiment and contemplation. I am formed, if for anything not in common with the herd of mankind, to apprehend minute and remote distinctions of feeling, whether relative to external nature or the living beings which surround us, and to communicate the conceptions which result from considering either the moral or the material universe as a whole. Of course I believe these faculties, which perhaps comprehend all that is sublime in man, to exist very imperfectly in my own mind—I cannot but be conscious, in much of what I write, of an absence of that tranquillity which is the attribute and accompaniment of power.'

'Adonais' he valued as the 'least imperfect' of his compositions; he speaks of it as a 'highly wrought piece of art.' Hostile reviews did not shake his confidence. 'It is absurd,' he writes, 'to criticise "Adonais," and still more to pretend 'that the verses are bad.' The only important general contribution which he made to literary criticism is the 'Defence 'of Poetry.' This incomplete essay was intended to answer Peacock's article on the 'Four Ages of Poetry,' which appeared in 1820 in 'Ollier's Magazine.' Shelley believed that poets are not the witnesses but the interpreters of their age. They are the standard-bearers of ideas rather than the mirror of life; they march in the van of the forlorn hopes of the world. Uniting in themselves the characters of law-

givers and prophets, they are 'the hierophants of an unapprehended inspiration, the unacknowledged legislators of the world.' Only the portion of the essay which deals with the elements and principles of poetry was completed. Shelley intended the second part to treat of 'the present state of the cultivation of poetry,' and to defend 'the attempt to idealise the modern forms of manners and opinions, and compel them into a subordination to the imagination and creative faculty.' A fresh interest has been given to Shelley's 'Defence of Poetry' by the inaugural lecture of Professor Palgrave at Oxford. The Professor of Poetry claimed for poetry, as did Shelley, an imperial function of a guiding and ruling force in national life. While admitting the wide influence of poets, we think the claim is too large. Shelley exercised no such power, partly because he is too cosmopolitan, partly because he addresses only a select few. In the one case he is too universal to be national; in the other he is too subtle to reach the ear of the masses.

For music Shelley had no great taste. Mozart was his favourite composer; simple airs appealed most strongly to his feelings. At the same time he was irritably intolerant of ugly sounds, like the voice of his Scotch servant at Edinburgh. Architecture, again, attracted him less than Nature; the exterior of Milan Cathedral impressed him, but he was not greatly struck by St. Peter's at Rome. With his keen love of the expression of beauty it was natural that he should keenly enjoy both pictures and statuary. But he was guided in his criticism solely by his instinct; he had made no study of the different schools. The correctness of his taste was rapidly developed by his life on the Continent. One of the chief objects of his stay in Italy was to study art, to observe 'the degree in which, and the rules according to which, that ideal beauty of which we have so intense, yet so obscure, an apprehension is realised in external forms.' Among painters he placed Raphael first, and after him Guido and Salvator Rosa. In his preference for the two latter painters he was unconsciously guided by the traditions of the Romantic school. They were the favourite painters of Horace Walpole; Salvator Rosa was the artist whom Mrs. Radcliffe imitated; Godwin preferred Guido to any of his Italian rivals. Michael Angelo Shelley did not at first appreciate, though his taste was modified as he saw more of the great Florentine. In his 'Defence of Poetry,' he classes Michael Angelo with Raphael as the two great painters who exercised a civilising influence on the world. In the works of the

Greek sculptors he found 'the gods whom we should worship.' His notes on the sculptures in the galleries of Rome and Florence are published by Mr. Forman. The Niobe, Venus Anadyomene, and the group of Bacchus and Ampelus excited his poetic imagination to the highest pitch of enthusiasm. Among his letters to Peacock occur the following striking remarks, written from Pompeii in 1819, on the subject of Greek art:—

'I now understand why the Greeks were such great poets; and, above all, I can account, it seems to me, for the harmony, the unity, the perfection, the uniform excellence, of all their works of art. They lived in a perpetual commerce with external nature, and nourished themselves upon the spirit of its forms. Their theatres were all open to the mountains and the sky. Their columns, the ideal types of a sacred forest, with its roof of interwoven tracery, admitted the light and wind; the odour and the freshness of the country penetrated the cities. Their temples were mostly upathric, and the flying clouds, the stars, or the deep sky were seen above. O, but for that series of wretched wars which terminated in the Roman conquest of the world; but for the Christian religion, which put the finishing stroke on the ancient system; but for those changes that conducted Athens to its ruin—to what an eminence might not humanity have arrived!' (Vol. iv. pp. 78, 79.)

Shelley's letters are entirely free from the literary artifices of the eighteenth century. He never composes in the polished style of Gray; his unstudiedness is, unlike that of Walpole, real. In ease and artlessness, though not in wit, his letters most resemble those of Cowper. He seems to have been an irregular correspondent. He only writes when the occasion offers or the fancy seizes him. Hence his letters are never strained or trivial; they are wholly without false glitter or forced point; they express the fresh natural feelings of an expansive leisured poet who writes in the midst of surroundings which at once stimulated and displayed his powers. The dew is always on his thoughts. The letters afford a most valuable running commentary on his poetry, and give a private view of the working of his mind. Expressions, trains of thought, epithets reappear in a different form in the poems on which his mind was engaged. His correspondence is full of valuable autobiographical details, curious metaphysical suggestions, eloquent descriptions of Italian manners, scenery and art. It is difficult to refrain from again expressing regret that Mr. Forman has not made the collection of these delightful letters more complete. Some of Shelley's word-pictures in prose scarcely suffer by comparison with his poetic masterpieces on similar subjects. Few of the letters are without exquisite proofs of his descriptive powers. The

following sketch of the falls of Velino is taken almost at random :

‘ The glaciers of Montanvert and the source of the Arveiron is the grandest spectacle I ever saw. This is the second. But words (and far less could painting) will not express it. Stand upon the brink of the platform of cliff which is directly opposite. You see the ever-moving water stream down. It comes in thick and tawny folds, flaking off like solid snow gliding down a mountain. It does not seem hollow within, but without it is unequal, like the folding of linen thrown carelessly down ; your eye follows it, and it is lost below : not in the black rocks which gird it around, but in its own foam and spray in the cloudlike vapours boiling up from below, which is not like rain, nor mist, nor spray, nor foam, but water, in a shape wholly unlike anything I ever saw before. It is as white as snow, but thick and impenetrable to the eye. The very imagination is bewildered by it. A thunder comes up from the abyss wonderful to hear, for, though it ever sounds, it is never the same, but, modulated by the changing motion, rises and falls intermittingly. We passed half an hour in one spot looking at it, and thought but a few minutes had gone by.’ (Vol. iv. pp. 57, 58.)

After his visit to Rome in 1818 he wrote to Peacock a letter from which the following passage is quoted :

‘ The English burying-place is a green slope near the walls, under the pyramidal tomb of Cestius, and is, I think, the most beautiful and solemn cemetery I ever beheld. To see the sun shining on its bright grass (fresh, when we first visited it, with the autumnal dews), and hear the whispering of the wind among the leaves of the trees which have overgrown the tomb of Cestius, and the soil which is stirring in the sun-warm earth ; and to mark the tombs, mostly of women and young people who were buried there, one might, if one were to die, desire the sleep they seem to sleep. Such is the human mind, and so it peoples with its wishes vacancy and oblivion.’ (Vol. iv. pp. 63, 64.)

Before four years had passed, the ashes of Shelley were buried in the English cemetery at Rome, near the ‘ keen pyramid with ‘wedge sublime,’ which marked the tomb of Caius Cestius.

A true poet-soul, fresh, eager, full of genius, trustful in his fellows and their future, Shelley threw himself, before he had learned to swim, into the eddying stream of life ; at one moment he was swept along by the current on the bounding tide of humanitarian enthusiasm, at another dragged down to the treacherous depths of personal dejection ; finally, after a struggle as brief as it was vehement, he was cast upon the cruel shores bruised, torn, and breathless. His career was brief. ‘ The life,’ he wrote, of a man of ‘ talent who should die in his thirtieth year is, with ‘ regard to his own feelings, longer than that of a miserable ‘ priest-ridden slave who dreams out a century of delusion.’

He was only twenty-nine when the waters of the Mediterranean made him in death what he had been in life, 'one with Nature.' At war with society and under its ban, first its foe and then its victim, Shelley has been the favourite theme of those who love to theorise on the evil destiny of poetic temperaments. Some of his friends have contended that he received Jedwood justice—first the execution, then the sentence; and finally, if at all, the investigation. We are not of that opinion. Até dies not childless; Shelley's fate could hardly have been otherwise. Of him it cannot be said, 'his worst he kept, his best he gave;' for he gave both indiscriminately. Conscious that nothing mean, malignant, or selfish underlay his mental vagaries, he never appreciated the effect upon the minds of others of his proselytising assaults on received opinions. It is a convincing proof of his good faith and defective judgement, that he was not only astonished, but hurt at the results. Had he lived till middle life he would have outgrown the hysterical passion of his youthful struggles against law and custom.

Yet, apart from this question, his career possesses a fascination which is as perennial as it is irresistible. The sharp contrasts of his hopes and his failures, the promise and the fruits of his marvellous powers, will never cease to excite both pity and regret for his untimely end. His genius, in the few short years of its exercise, enriched the heritage of national glory with a treasure as priceless as that which the longest-lived of his most illustrious contemporaries transmitted to posterity. The pathos of his untimely death is intensified by his loveable character, which still attracts, by its strange beauty, the affections of men who, after the lapse of half a century, know him only by distant report. The tragedy is heightened by the peculiar isolation of the companionless woman who endured by his side the obloquy of society, guarded his name with jealous pride, and hardly lived to hear the first faint whisper of the ever-swelling chorus of praise with which the world endeavours to do tardy and incomplete justice to the greatness of her husband's genius. No more touching monument has been reared to his memory than the lament of Mrs. Shelley:

'The glory of the dream is gone. I am a cloud from which the light of sunset has passed. Give me patience in the present struggle. Meum cordium cor! Good night!

'I would give
All that I am to be as now thou art;
But I am chained to time, and cannot thence depart.'

ART. III.—1. *Through the British Empire.* By BARON VON HÜBNER, formerly Austrian Ambassador in Paris and Rome. 2 vols. London: 1886.

2. *The Western Pacific and New Guinea.* By HUGH HASTINGS ROMILLY. London: 1886.

IF Englishmen of the present day continue imperfectly acquainted with the vast colonial dominion which has expanded their small insular kingdom into a mighty and extensive empire, it will not be from deficiency of information or from want of competence in those who furnish it. Since the beginning of the present year, and within a few weeks of each other, there have appeared two works of the first importance and by eminent hands describing a considerable portion of the British possessions beyond the sea. One of these, the ‘*Oceana*’ of Mr. Froude, we have already noticed.* To the other, the narrative of more than a year’s wanderings by the veteran diplomatist and adventurous traveller, Baron von Hübner, we propose to devote much of the present article. It is not our intention, nor is there any necessity, to draw a contrast between the productions of these distinguished persons. Our object is to direct attention to regions which are described for us, and to invite an examination of circumstances and events which have received less consideration in this country than their importance deserves. It must, however, be pointed out that Baron Hübner’s volumes differ materially from ‘*Oceana*.’ The Baron’s travels were more extended, and his absence from Europe more prolonged, than Mr. Froude’s. The former stayed some time in South Africa, he visited Australia twice, and he traversed great part of British India. His narrative, therefore, deals, to a great extent, with countries with which we are tolerably familiar. But he carries us further and into less known regions. He cruised in the South Seas, and he paints for us scenes, and records impressions formed of places and communities, which no one of an eminence or an experience approaching his own has ever visited. The information which he imparts concerning these remote portions of the world is enlarged by that to be found in the entertaining work of Mr. Hugh Romilly, ‘*The Western Pacific and New Guinea*.’

It is not to be expected that, in two volumes of moderate

* Edinburgh Review, vol. clxiii. No. cccxxiv.

size, containing the relation of travels extending over upwards of 50,000 miles, we shall find much more than a story of personal adventures and descriptions of the multitude of places visited. Baron Hübner did not write, either in the first place or chiefly, for English readers. There is no announcement on the title-page that his book in the form before us is a translation. But it is known that the English version appeared simultaneously with, or but a few days after, the publication of the work in French, the language in which the Baron wrote his earlier '*Promenade autour du Monde*,' one of the most delightful books of travel ever printed; and we believe that it has also been published in German. The edition under notice is, in fact, a translation made under the immediate supervision of the author, who has a far from common knowledge of our language and literature. We shall show by and by on what we base our opinion that the translation is admirably executed, and that the rare felicity of style which is attributed to Baron Hübner by French readers has not been impaired by the English authors of the present version. It appears, indeed, from a comparison of the English version with the French edition, that the Baron is indebted to his English translator for the correction of a good many mistakes of names and of facts, which are pardonable in a foreign writer, but not the less comical. There was no such person as 'General Wellington' and no such prelate as a 'Bishop of Norfolk Island.' The narrative was written for the continental, at least as much as for the English public. It is perhaps on this account that we find in '*Through the British Empire*' few of the weighty judgements of affairs and political tendencies which add so greatly to the value of Mr. Froude's '*Oceana*.'

The Baron tells us in one place of his determination to 'confine these pages to a simple recital of what I saw and 'heard.' We have no right to regret this, as the result is a remarkably entertaining narrative. But readers who expect to derive something more than entertainment from the perusal of a work by a man of great eminence and experience will be apt to regard this fresh account of countries, of which they have already heard a good deal, as somewhat superficial. The author does not weary us with statistics, which he considerably relegates to the foot notes; and he honourably quotes his authorities, many of whom are, no doubt, less known on the Continent than in England. It is true that he sums up the opinions held by those who differ in their estimate of the condition and the prospects of the

several portions of the British empire through which he passed. But the summing up is usually merely an elegant *précis*, not in the least judicial, for a decision seldom follows it. It may be possible occasionally to divine to which side the author leans; but, as a rule, the reader will have to decide for himself. The opinions expressed have been summarised in the Baron's language—for we cannot venture to attribute to all his interlocutors such grace of diction as clothes the expression of their views in the work before us—and may have received some colour in the process.

We confess, nevertheless, that we would willingly give up many of the fascinating descriptions of scenery, or the charming passages criticising the fine arts among the nations visited, with which the book abounds, for something more downright than the rather vague expressions in the 'conclusion.' This may be only insular selfishness and oblivion of the fact that our countrymen compose but a fraction of the Baron's public; but it is not unpardonable, in view of the perplexing nature of the problems that we have to face, to have looked for instruction from so capable an observer. Some guidance might have been obtained from one of his rare experience in the old Europe of Metternich; and the third generation would have listened with interest to one who at Vienna had 'seen the walls from which the enemy of civilisation was driven back for ever, and within those walls had witnessed the death of the last Roman emperor.'* When we follow the Baron to the South Seas, we find him not only an agreeable companion, but an instructive and, to a high degree, original authority. Therefore to the portion of his narrative recording his experiences in that little known quarter of the globe we shall chiefly give our attention.

In many respects the Baron's volumes resemble the books of travel of an older generation. They have not been hastily published. The author returned from his travels a year and a half before his book issued from the press. Great care has evidently been exercised in preparing it for publication. Statements of fact rest upon actual observation or upon authorities of repute. The style is, throughout, admirably suited to the matter. The descriptions of scenery are marked by a fidelity and grace that have probably never been surpassed. To the discussion of artistic questions, as shown in the observations on the architectural monuments

* Vol. ii. pp. 142-3.

of India, the author brings a stock of erudition and an appreciative knowledge of European art that many a professional critic might envy. The unusual extent of his previous wanderings enables him to make many apt comparisons. In several passages he rises to real eloquence.

A few extracts will not only show the truth of what has just been stated; they will also prove how well he has been served by his translator, and how excellent must be the style which imposes so few fetters upon an alien version. We may take, to begin with, his description of the scenery at Cape Town, which, as he says, countless travellers have visited and many have attempted to describe.

‘As if it were given to pen or pencil to portray on paper or canvas the glorious panorama which seizes, fascinates, and intoxicates one on arriving!—that enormous block with level top called Table Mountain, rising south of the town in one mass, flanked by two gigantic rocks, the Lion’s Head on one side and the Devil’s Peak on the other—that mighty barrier against which the storms that lash unceasingly the Southern Seas spend their fury in vain, the image and emblem of immobility, notwithstanding the variety of its changing hues, blue as opal in the morning, dull gold in the afternoon, rose-coloured when the sun is sinking near the horizon, and violet-purple when it has set. At the foot of this colossus extends a dark green fringe flecked with white—the gardens, plantations, spires, and houses of Cape Town. Farther eastward a light green expanse flecked with yellow—the meadows and the sandhills. And above the plain, stretching away to the interior, loom the jagged chains of the Blue Mountains. Who could fail to be enthusiastic at such a sight?’ (Vol. i. pp. 17, 18.)

The description of the scenery of Lake Wakatipu in the South Island of New Zealand is equally fine. The sides of the lake,

‘consisting of treeless mountains, shrouded in a whitish yellow mist, rise gradually to a height of 5,000 or 6,000 feet. . . . The transparent shadows of the dark clouds passing by, the greenish-brown boulders tinged with yellow, the dark blue water of the lake, the opal sky with light fleecy clouds of white, formed a landscape that seemed to me entirely new. I have seen nothing like it in the Alps, the Pyrenees, the Caucasus, or the Cordilleras. The whole was stern, grand, fantastic, and charming, in spite of its monotony, varied, however, by the changing reflections of the sunlight. . . .

‘In the space of a few hours, by one of those sudden changes in the weather which are peculiar to these islands, a summer’s evening has followed on a winter’s day. The lake is silver gilt, a dull gold lightly silvered. At the farthest end of the landscape, towards the north-west, and forming (as it were) a frame to this brilliant mirror, the jagged outline of the dark mountains stands out clear-cut against a sky which is orange below, then pink, and higher up bright blue.

Here and there small flakes of blackish mist, edged with light grey, still mark the outlines of the crest from which they have just detached themselves. Overhead, beneath a dark-blue sky, pink clouds are floating, shaped like a shower of rockets. Then night comes on, and the full moon rises above the glaciers.' (Vol. i. p. 173.)

But here, as in other parts of these new countries, 'what the landscape wants is man.' There is no culture visible, nor trace of human habitation, and the visitor misses amid these alpine scenes 'the exuberant vegetation of the Swiss valleys, whose rural charms contrast so well with the severe and imposing character of the glaciers that tower above.'

Readers of contemporary narratives of travel will know how seldom they contain anything like the author's observations on the mosques of Ahmedabad (vol. ii. pp. 36-40), or his comparison of Christian with Mahometan art when discussing the architecture of the Jumma Musjid at Delhi (vol. ii. pp. 136-7). In perusing those passages we are reminded of the serious quartos of the early years of the century. Yet there is no lack of anecdote, enlivening and well told. When in Natal, Baron Hübner was lodged in the apartment which had been occupied by the unfortunate Prince Impérial, and then by the Empress Eugénie. The circumstance awakens a reminiscence of his embassy in Paris. The sentences in which he relates this, in the significant compression of their style, recall a chapter of 'Tacitus.' But it is not our intention to follow the Baron along the more beaten track of his progress, or to indulge in his reminiscences of other times or more courtly scenes. We prefer to accompany him into more remote and less known regions.

In May 1884, during his second visit to Australia, an opportunity, of which the Baron took advantage, of visiting the islands of the South Pacific offered itself. A ship of war, the 'Espion', was starting on a cruise in the South Seas, and he accepted an invitation of her captain to accompany him during part of it. It was arranged that on a certain day, six weeks ahead, the ship was to be at an appointed spot on the route of the mail steamer from Sydney to San Francisco. The steamer was to take the traveller 'on board in the middle of the Pacific, weather permitting.' This feat was successfully accomplished; and he went on to the Sandwich Islands, and returned to Europe across the continent of America. During his cruise in the man-of-war he had visited Norfolk Island, several parts of Fiji, Keppel Island, Upolu of the Navigators' Islands (Samoa), and Tutuila of the same group. He thus became practically acquainted

with that Western Pacific of which, in this country, we have lately heard a little, and of which we shall probably hear a great deal more.

What is the 'Western Pacific'? Mr. Hugh Romilly, to whose diverting pages we shall have occasion to recur, tells us that it 'represents a slice of some fifteen million square miles of land and ocean.' Baron Hübner is more explicit. He says:—

'The term "Western Pacific," which is constantly used in the English correspondence, has never yet been defined in a precise and authentic manner, but it is understood to comprise all the groups of Oceania lying between the two tropics and the 140th meridian of east and the 170th meridian of west longitude.* Three different races share this vast region—the Papuan, the Melanesian, and the Polynesian. In point of civilisation, three distinct divisions, excluding the Fijis (which have become an English colony), are recognised. The first comprehends the New Hebrides, Santa Cruz, the Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, New Britain, New Ireland, &c., whose inhabitants belong to the Melanesian race. These are savages, and for the most part heathens and cannibals. In other groups—mainly those of Tonga and Samoa—the inhabitants are Christians in name and half civilised. In Tonga there is a king and a nominally constitutional form of government, the supreme and absolute power being practically vested in the Wesleyan missionary, Mr. Baker. Wallis Island, like that of Fortuna, is inhabited by an exclusively Roman Catholic population, and governed by a queen, who regards a brief of Pope Pius IX. as the most precious jewel of her crown. Some Roman Catholic missionaries direct her conscience and govern her country. In Samoa a phantom king exists in the presence of a European community, and indirectly under the imperfect and limited influence of the English, German, and American consuls. Finally there is a third class of islands, the inhabitants of which have made some progress on the road to civilisation, respect the authority of their chiefs, and remain attached to their usages and customs, but possess no organised government. New Guinea is still an almost unexplored land.' (Vol. ii. pp. 390–1.)

The official document,† from which the Baron derives much of his information, declares that 'for all practical

* This definition of the 'Western Pacific' is not quite correct. The Declaration concluded at Berlin on April 6 between the British and German Governments provides that the expression "Western Pacific" 'means that part of the Pacific Ocean lying between the 15th parallel of north latitude and the 30th parallel of south latitude, and between the 165th meridian of longitude west and the 139th meridian of longitude east of Greenwich.'

† Report of a Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Western Pacific Orders in Council. Presented February 1884.

‘purposes the limits of the Western Pacific are nearly ‘conterminous with those of the Australian naval station,’ which extends north of the equator to the 12th parallel, and from the 180th meridian to the 160th of west longitude. Mr. Romilly remarks that it is strange ‘that we should still ‘be as ignorant of the interior of Bougainville, San Cristoval, Guadalcanar, New Britain, New Ireland, and many ‘other countries, and of their inhabitants, as their first discoverers were.’

Three centuries have elapsed since Englishmen began to sail over the South Seas. Their earlier visits had a predatory object. Drake and his companions thought that the King of Spain’s beard was long enough to be singed in Peru as well as at Cadiz. Anson rounded ‘the Horn’ in search of galleons. Then came the period of exploration. Wallis, and Carteret, and Cook, and Bligh, and others whose less eminent names still survive in the geographical nomenclature of these remote regions, opened the way for the visits of the whaler and the trader. It seemed as if all the fruits of intercourse with Oceania were to be gathered by the English and the Americans. On one side of the Pacific, Spanish conquest stopped at the shore of America; on the other, no Spaniard permanently settled beyond the limits of the Philippine and the Ladrone Archipelagoes. The other great colonising nation, the Dutch, had been conquered by revolutionary France, and with her had to submit to exclusion from the sea. In the long peace that followed the fall of Napoleon, Dumont d’Urville revived the memory of Bougainville, of La Pérouse, and of d’Entrecasteaux. The French flag again appeared in the South Seas. German commerce began to show itself upon the ocean.

In the meantime the enterprise of the men, who were expanding the British settlements in Australia into the flourishing colonies through which Baron Hübner travelled, found a new sphere of action in the islands of the Western Pacific. The sandal-wood trade was carried on, as Mr. Romilly tells us, with the New Hebrides and the Solomon Islands, to this day the seats of the most savage of the Melanesian tribes. It was rough work, and rough and desperate men formed the crews of the ships employed in it. ‘There are stories still ‘told,’ says Mr. Romilly, ‘of the truth of which I know ‘nothing, as to the lawless character of the men engaged in ‘that trade, and the brutal massacres which frequently took ‘place. That the trade was a very ill-regulated and lawless ‘one there is no doubt, but no one was ever brought to

'justice for excesses committed by those engaged in it.' He adds that while the trade lasted it was very profitable, and that it was chiefly conducted by Americans. Our own countrymen, however, either as principals or agents, had a considerable share in it and in the *bêche de mer* trade also.

'Adventurers poured in in large numbers, and soon the British Government found themselves compelled to interfere in order to prevent and repress, as far as possible, the crimes and offences committed by British subjects. Several Acts of Parliament, the first of which was 57 George III. c. 53, were passed with this object.' (Hübner, vol. ii. p. 392.)

The laws were almost entirely inoperative. Such restraint as was put upon the desperadoes who frequented the islands of the Pacific, 'that former Eldorado for bad characters,' was due to the action of the captains of our ships of war, whose visits to its archipelagoes were even rarer than they are now. The naval officers exercised a kind of extra-legal and customary jurisdiction over British subjects. Feeling bound to act against the natives if an Englishman had suffered wrong, they did their utmost to prevent their countrymen from ill-treating the islanders. On the whole their proceedings were highly beneficial, and their good effect is still visible. At this moment white men, long resident on the more remote islands, treat the captain of a man-of-war with immense deference, spontaneously report themselves to him, wait upon him with the 'log books,' in which many of them keep a record of their doings, and readily submit to his decision in matters of dispute with the natives.

'The commanders of the English cruisers, as was universally allowed, performed their duties generally with tact and discretion. They could not inflict punishment on the coloured populations, except in cases qualified as "acts of war ;" but, while giving a more or less wide interpretation to that elastic term, they succeeded in doing much good and preventing much harm. The appearance of a man-of-war never failed to produce a salutary effect on both the white residents and the natives of the locality. When a white, being a British subject, had committed some serious crime, or become generally obnoxious as an habitual disturber of public order, he was either taken to Australia for trial, or more often deported to some other island remote from the scene of his misdeeds. These proceedings were somewhat summary, and, though warranted by official instructions, somewhat arbitrary ; but they had a strong deterrent effect, the more so as the traders offered no resistance.' (Hübner, vol. ii. p. 394.)

The real sanction of the naval captain's proceedings was the absence of publicity. In preserving order he was bringing himself into conflict with the law. So long as all account of

his action was confined to his official report to his superiors he had little to fear, if his decisions had been consonant with natural justice. But as trade and navigation in the South Seas extended, the number of people with a story to tell increased; and as the means of communication with the rest of the world multiplied, facilities for publishing it arose. Exactly half a century ago a committee of the House of Commons reported that the proceedings of British subjects in the South Seas were 'lawless and infamous.' Attempts were made to insure order by legislative enactment; but only a little was done, and that little was not successful. Then what Mr. Romilly calls the 'old labour trade' began. How far the state of affairs had improved may be divined from the remarks of an eminent French savant, M. de Quatrefages, in a strictly scientific work.* 'The atrocities committed by the sandalwood robbers have been surpassed by those of the pirates, who devoted themselves to the labour traffic or 'labour trade.' The comment of the man of science is:— 'However melancholy the narrative may be, it will at least serve the purpose of proving that the savage element still exists in the most civilised nations.'

Those who wish to learn something of the deeds that converted the 'summer isles of Eden,' lying in the Western Pacific, into scenes of violence and butchery, should consult Captain A. H. Markham's narrative of his cruise amongst the New Hebrides in 1871.† They will find that the difficulties of an officer charged to restrain his fellow countrymen from committing atrocities in which no savages could outdo them were greatly increased, because 'the vessels engaged in the so-called labour trade were owned, more or less, by large and influential houses in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, and Auckland;' and that 'the commanders of men-of-war had not been supported by the colonial law courts in their endeavours to put a stop to the nefarious practice of stealing natives from the different islands.' Public feeling in England was deeply stirred by a tragical event which was allowed to have been caused by the determination of the islanders to take vengeance on, at all events, the fellow countrymen of those by whom they had been infamously ill used. This was the murder of the saintly Bishop Patteson.

* The Human Species (International Scientific Series). London: 1879.

† The Cruise of the Rosario. London: 1873.

It was generally felt that something must be done to check the prevailing lawlessness. The impossibility of securing a conviction in the colonial courts, or of getting an adequate sentence, if pronounced, carried out when a white man was the criminal, rendered the creation of a new system of procedure inevitable. In 1875 an Act of Parliament was passed which provided for the appointment, by Order in Council, of a High Commissioner having jurisdiction over all British subjects throughout the Western Pacific, and for the constitution of a court to take cognisance of all offences committed within its limits, with full powers of dealing with them.

The institution of the High Commission, we are told by Baron Hübner, 'virtually put an end to the judicial intervention of naval officers, or rather made such intervention, where still found necessary, an awkward, delicate, and embarrassing matter.' The High Commissioner was empowered to appoint subordinate officials as deputy commissioners with a limited, but perhaps sufficient, jurisdiction over British subjects. For some reason, probably a financial one, the only two resident deputy commissioners were appointed for the Friendly and Navigators' groups, or just those regions in which the natives were most civilised, and order was most rarely disturbed by white men. Mr. Romilly's office of Deputy Commissioner in New Guinea is of recent date, and is practically merged in that of assistant to the Special Commissioner.

The system not only failed as a means of preserving public order; its adoption made the condition of Oceania worse than it had been. 'The great legal powers of the High Commission are everywhere, and especially in the less visited groups, rendered inoperative by the want of an executive to enforce them, while, on the other hand, the assumed jurisdiction exercised by the navy has been to a certain extent extinguished.'* To remedy this lamentable state of things some further step was necessary. We might have made arrangements for the more frequent patrolling of the waters of the Western Pacific, or we might have tried to bring about some sort of international agreement for the suppression of lawlessness. The first plan would have cost money, a small fraction, probably, of the sums which we had spent on endeavours to prevent Spaniards and Brazilians from carrying on a 'labour trade' of their own. The second

* Hübner, vol. ii. p. 396.

would have been rather unusual, and might, no doubt, have been difficult to arrange.

Instead of adopting either plan we had recourse to an expedient, the merits of which are open to question. Under pressure, which it would have been unbecoming to resist, the naval authorities consented to the appointment of the captains of her Majesty's ships as deputy commissioners. Though it is not clearly stated, we may discover by reading between the lines of the official Report of Inquiry, already alluded to, that the step has been condemned as unadvisable. The influence which the captains of our men-of-war had still retained over the white men met with during their cruises was diminished rather than increased. Among the 'beach-combers' and labour-traders there were plenty of 'sea-lawyers,' who would soon learn to appreciate the advantages of the situation thus created. Whatever crime he may have committed, however menacing to public order his presence at any particular spot may have been, no British subject could 'be reached except through a regular legal 'process.' The captain of the man-of-war might threaten as he pleased; the desperado now knew not only that he himself was hedged about with the sheltering intricacies of legal procedure due to the establishment of the High Commission, but also that the captain had been converted from an officer with an overwhelming physical force at his disposal to insure the execution of his equitable decrees, into a subordinate of the High Commissioner hampered in his action by the necessity of observing strictly legal forms.

It is unanimously admitted that, under the exceptionally unfavourable conditions imposed upon them, the naval officers have acted with great discretion, and by their zeal and good sense have prevented the situation from becoming even more intolerable than it is. To us they appear to deserve a great deal of sympathy. The public in England and in the Australasian colonies, altogether ignorant of the circumstances amid which they work, holds them responsible for the preservation of order in the South Seas, notwithstanding that the creation of the High Commission has 'tended to reduce their influence amongst the whites, whilst 'tying their hands in their dealings with the natives.'* Already charged with the performance of the most exacting and anxious duties that are assigned to naval officers during peace, their labours and responsibilities have been greatly

* Report of Inquiry, &c., p. 10.

augmented. Officers of high rank in an ancient and distinguished service, on being forced to receive appointments as deputy commissioners, find themselves placed on a level with the inferior members of the newly founded establishment at Fiji, who, however personally worthy, had no official experience, and often owe their nomination to the accident of being engaged in seeking their fortunes in the Western Pacific when the posts happened to fall vacant. Not only have the naval officers had to perform additional duties and assume additional responsibilities without remuneration or reward of any sort; there is not, we believe, a single instance in which they have been repaid the expenses that they have incurred.

But had the system devised by our authorities for the maintenance of order in the Pacific been far better considered than it was, its failure would still have been inevitable. The Ocean was visited more and more frequently by white men who owed no allegiance to the British Crown, and could not be touched by British law. Even in its most virtuous moments the public in England, and still less in the colonies, cannot be depended on to contemplate with satisfaction the punishment of our fellow-countrymen for committing acts of the same kind and on the same scene as those which foreigners may commit with impunity. Were there no such obstacle to the prosecution of Englishmen, it would soon have followed that the authorities would find no Englishmen to prosecute. The latter would simply have repudiated their nationality. With what facility they could, by so doing, secure protection against the consequences of their illegal acts is well illustrated by the story of a schooner reported in December 1883 by the naval commander in the New Hebrides. This vessel, being strongly suspected of kidnapping, had changed her name, had altered her rig, had been disguised in various ways, and had carried three different flags during the year, having been all the time under the virtual control of one man, her former British registered owner. The very able and energetic officer who encountered this Protean schooner could do nothing more than order a few questions to be put to her captain, as she was protected by a foreign flag.

The natives of Oceania began to count among their acquaintances two new tribes. In addition to the 'white man,' the name universally given by them to the Englishman and the American, there came amongst them the 'man-oui-oui' and the 'German-man.' The French had

formed a settlement, soon to grow into a great penitentiary, in New Caledonia. This was near enough to the New Hebrides to facilitate the emigration to them of some far from desirable French settlers. Vessels, flying the flag of the free city of Hamburg, and then the tricolor of Imperial Germany, sailed about the South Seas. Trading stations were founded in a multitude of islands, and a moderate but lucrative traffic sprang up, which was generally conducted by Germans. Though the sandalwood trade had come to an end owing to the extermination of the trees, there was still a market for the produce of the South Sea Islands. *Bêche de mer* and shark's fins were in demand in China; but cocoanut oil and afterwards *copra*, or dried cocoanut pulp, the raw material from which the oil is made, were the most important exports. Little oil now leaves the islands, and almost, if not quite, all the *copra* is sent to Europe. Two or three Hamburg firms scattered their agents about the archipelagoes to barter with the natives European goods for cocoanuts, and, with the aid of native labour, to convert the nuts into *copra*. Vessels periodically visit the different stations, bringing supplies to the traders and taking the *copra* away. This is collected at certain 'head stations' to await the arrival of the ships which transport it to Europe. By an undesigned arrangement, or at least without formal agreement, these firms at first carried on their operations in different quarters of Oceania, and for a considerable time were not in competition with each other. So long as this state of affairs lasted the business was highly remunerative. The extension of operations, however, brought the representatives of a firm into contact with those of others. Competition ensued, and became still more animated on the appearance of agents trading on behalf of English houses. Profits, which had been relatively high, declined. The greatest of all the German houses failed. Planting promised results that would make up for the diminished profits of simple trading. To the failure of the Hamburg firm we may attribute the aspect which international relations have now assumed in the Western Pacific; to the formation of plantations the treatment that the natives have had to undergo, and the revival in Melanesia of atrocities perpetrated by white men.

It was obvious that, to insure success in commercial relations with the natives, their good treatment by the resident 'trader' was essentially necessary. Some abominable ruffians, no doubt, were engaged in trading on behalf of

principals who, so long as business was brisk, did not trouble themselves about their agents' conduct. But, on the whole, the 'produce trader' behaved to the islanders, and was regarded by them, very differently from the 'labour trader.' Baron Hübner gives us an account of a trader's station at Niua-tobu-tābu, or Keppel's Island.

'On the shore close by the spot where we landed is seen the hut of one of the three whites who reside in this isle. They are traders, the name given to the agents employed by Australian, English, or German houses, who send out to them (at double the price charged in European markets) penknives, knives, cotton prints, tobacco, and other articles prized by the savage, and none to a greater extent than firearms. The trader who works this or that group of islands exchanges these wares (sometimes at the rate of 700 or 800 per cent.) for copra and cotton, which he sends to Apia, Suva, Levuka, or Tonga, wherever the branch house of the firm may be, whence they are forwarded to Europe, generally at an enormous profit. If the trader is sober, intelligent, and energetic, and if he is not killed (a fate to which he is especially exposed in the Melanesian Archipelago), he makes in a few years a comparatively large fortune. Living costs him next to nothing; he has brought with him to the island a stock of preserved provisions, which he renews from time to time when necessary. He lives chiefly on yam, bananas, and poultry. . . . But unfortunately many of these men are neither sober, active, nor energetic. The climate enervates them. They work only just enough to live, and they live from hand to mouth.' (Vol. ii. pp. 349, 350.)

Mr. Romilly's account agrees with this; and both he and the Baron mention the existence among the traders of the 'latest descendants of the rowdies of former days,' and of the 'beach-comber of recent date,' who is 'merely an English 'savage of a low type.'* Baron Hübner makes a remark to which special attention may be directed. He says: 'The 'trade itself, which formerly had a very doubtful reputation, 'is evidently improving morally, since communication with 'the civilised world has become more frequent.' Indeed, had it not been for the introduction of the labour trade, consequent on the establishment of plantations in Fiji, Samoa, Tahiti, and Queensland, there is little doubt that the civilising effect of commerce would have been experienced in Oceania as everywhere else.

The suitability of the soil of several South Sea Islands for the growth of cotton had been already demonstrated, when the occurrence of the American Civil War threatened to annihilate the supply of that important staple from the United

* Romilly, p. 194.

States. An immense impetus was thus given to the extension of cotton planting in new countries. The prospect opened to planters was highly encouraging. Land was cheap in Oceania; indeed square leagues could be purchased for a few articles of 'trade gear,' the value of which would not have bought a dozen acres of inferior farming land in Europe. A market was certain: prices were high; the one drawback was the want of labour. A great demand for land sprang up in the Pacific Islands. The natives, to whom the idea of an out-and-out sale of a parcel of land was absolutely incomprehensible, were persuaded, or tricked, or forced into making over to the white man the land which he wanted for his planting operations. The story of most of the 'purchases' effected would be ludicrous, were it not for their disastrous result on the former native proprietors, and the harvest of difficulties which they have bequeathed to those who endeavour to put the relations of whites with natives, of one civilised nation with another in the Pacific, on a proper footing.

Nowhere were justice and the rights of the native inhabitants more cynically disregarded than in Samoa by the great German trading firm. The people of that group belong to the finest of the Polynesian races; they are all nominally Christians, and have never deserved the title of 'savage,' except in its acceptance of 'not civilised.' Unhappily tribal animosities and the machinations of interested and unscrupulous white men led to a series of wars. The combatants were anxious to procure firearms, and the traders declined to sell them except for land. The result was that between 1869 and 1872 not less than 100,000 acres passed into German ownership at a virtual cost of a few pence per acre. For much, not even this consideration was given. The ignorant natives were deluded into signing documents which they could not in the least understand, and which were held to give the white occupiers a secure title. At present the German land claims in Samoa comprise 232,000 acres. British subjects claim not less than 357,000. There is, however, this important difference between the positions of the German and the British claimants: the former have so far made their claims effective that they occupy and cultivate just as much of the soil as they can work, whilst the latter's exist only on paper and are not insisted on by our Government.

Labour was wanted in many islands of the South Seas and in Queensland, where cotton planting had also been

begun. We learn from Captain Markham that there arose an extraordinary demand for labour, and procuring it became a most lucrative business. Captain R. Towns, owner of a plantation near Brisbane, was the first who had recourse to the importation of South Sea Island labourers. The trade was 'lucrative,' as we have seen, and the captain soon had imitators. Visitors to Lisbon may have observed, in the Buenos Ayres quarter of the city, several handsome mansions, which Englishmen scornfully point to as having been built with money earned in the slave trade. The stranger who notices the silence and deserted aspect of the finest streets in Macao will learn that before the British Government, which had suppressed the slave trade with its squadrons, interfered to prevent the Chinese coolie trade, these were the abodes of wealthy families. When we congratulate ourselves, as well we may, that, through our efforts, the walls of no more mansions at Buenos Ayres or Macao will be cemented with the blood of the slave or the coolie, we should remember what we have already been told. Vessels engaged in the lucrative Western Pacific labour trade 'were owned 'by large and influential houses in Sydney, Melbourne, 'Brisbane, and Auckland.' Is it to be wondered at that when we pride ourselves on the superior morality of our policy, when we recall the millions that we have spent to free the African, and to prevent the Spaniard, the Portuguese, and the Arab from enslaving him, we evoke a torrent of bitterness and contempt from foreign pens? Can we be surprised when an eminent man of science, who knows the history of the labour trade, chooses the acts of Englishmen as illustrations of the truth 'that the savage element still 'exists in the most civilised nations'? An Arabic translation of the reports of some recent trials in the Queensland Courts, if presented to the Sultan of Zanzibar, might give rise to some strange reflections in the breast of that potentate.

In spite of the promise of its early period, cotton planting did not succeed. The industry had been hardly started in the southern hemisphere before the American states were again in a condition to supply the markets of the world. After lingering a few years, in most places it died out. The abominations connected with the supply of labour for its prosecution had, in the mean time, so deeply stirred the public mind in England that the annexation of Fiji and its establishment as a Crown colony were decided on. It is just

twelve years since effect was given to this decision, and the change in the Archipelago is wonderful. Law and order reign undisturbed throughout the group. The natives are protected against spoliation and outrage. The natural resources of the country have been made available to meet the requirements of large and distant populations. Baron Hübner speaks in terms of high praise, but not higher than is deserved, of the labours of the first governor of Fiji, Sir Arthur Gordon, and his remarkably able coadjutor, Mr. Thurston, in converting this tropical pandemonium into a prosperous and law-abiding community.

In spite of the steps taken to suppress lawlessness in the Pacific, of which the annexation of Fiji was one, the attempt to divest the labour trade of its horrors has met with but indifferent success. In Fiji, which is a Crown colony and which has practically only a single port of entry for labour vessels, the regulations have resulted in removing many of the objections to the trade. But in Queensland they have generally proved a failure. At first it was supposed that they answered their purpose fairly well. We heard little of iniquities perpetrated by white men trying to engage Melanesians. Unhappily this was due not to the issue of regulations so much as to slackness in the demand for labourers. In time sugar planting replaced cotton planting, and, both in Queensland and in Fiji, extended rapidly. The earlier sugar planters secured handsome gains. Land fit for the cultivation of the cane was not suitable for the other great Queensland industries—stock raising and sheep farming—and could be got at a very low price. The services of Pacific Islanders were, relatively, far from costly. Incited by the success of the first planters, many persons occupied themselves in cane growing. Competition raised the price of land enormously. As in the days of cotton planting, the demand for labour greatly exceeded the hitherto available supply. Fleets of labour vessels covered the waters of Melanesia and penetrated to islands as yet untroubled by the ‘recruiter.’

In 1882 thirty vessels under the British flag and several under the German cruised amongst the New Hebrides. In 1883 New Britain and New Ireland were visited by many craft in search of labourers. In 1884 the islands adjacent to the eastern part of New Guinea were the scene of deeds which proved that, regulations notwithstanding, the vices of the old labour trade had reappeared in the new. We do not intend to tell the hideous tale of the ‘regulated’ trade;

we shall merely relate one or two incidents that have occurred within the last two or three years, from which the character of the business will be discerned, noting that, but for the precautions taken by the distinguished and high-minded man—Commodore Erskine—who commanded the squadron in the Western Pacific at the time, and for the vigilance of his officers, such incidents would have been far more common than they were.

In March of the year before last a case was tried in the Supreme Court of Queensland, the report of which deserves to be repeated. Two islanders, who, it seems, were 'not willing to be recruited,' were shot to death on board the "Alfred Vittery." Unwillingness to be recruited means, in plain English, objection to being kidnapped. The 'recruits,' not unnaturally under the circumstances, 'showed some obstinacy.' They had no firearms, but one had a knife and the other a bow and arrows. Instead of being overpowered and disarmed they were shot. When brought on deck it was found that one was still alive. 'It was decided,' says the writer of a letter* from Brisbane, 'to dispose of them—earth to water—but the one who was "a little bit alive" received an effectual quietus from a seaman named Grimes, who fired at his head and demolished it.' Of six of the labour vessel's crew who had been put on their trial the jury acquitted five, and found the sixth, the man who had 'demolished' the sorely wounded islander's head, guilty of manslaughter with a recommendation to mercy. So much for the jury's part in this revolting tragedy. Now for that of the judge, in whose proceedings we are bound to take a deep interest in view of the proposal recently made to transfer colonial judges to the English bench. Three days after the trial he let Grimes out on his own recognisances to appear when called upon to do so!

Not long afterwards the first case tried under the local Queensland Act against kidnapping also 'ended in a fiasco.' The master and boatswain of the 'Jessie Kelly' were charged with kidnapping a Torres Islander. The evidence was 'slightly conflicting;' but it appeared that the native came down to the schooner's boat to sell fish, that the boatswain tempted him with a pipe, and when he approached 'made a grab' at him. Thereupon the islander took to his heels, and the boat's crew was ordered to run after him and catch him. Having been caught, he was taken off to the vessel.

* Published in the 'Sydney Morning Herald,' April 9, 1884.

The jury found the two men on trial 'not guilty.' The writer of the letter already quoted observes of these cases that 'the law of Queensland seems quite unable to grip any 'of the transgressors of the Polynesian Labourers Act. 'None of us doubt that some of the worst villanies to which 'humanity is addicted are practised in connexion with the 'recruiting traffic. . . . The atrocious business has gone 'on for years.' Those who read these cases and the one which follows will perhaps feel a little uncertain whether the law or the administration of the law is most in fault.

In November 1884, 'a very interesting murder trial'* was brought to a close at Brisbane. An Act of the local legislature had previously been passed by which the evidence of pagan islanders was made admissible in cases of the kind. The second officer of the schooner 'Hopeful,' one McNeil, was charged with the murder of a native. The boats of the schooner were sent to a New Guinea village to recruit labourers, when a 'scrimmage' took place. Some spears were thrown at the boats' crews, who fired their rifles at the natives and killed several. At another place, some canoes 'came trustfully up to the "Hopeful"' to barter. A boat was lowered on the opposite side of the vessel, and out of sight of the people in the canoes. Her crew were all armed with rifles. The boat slipped round the schooner's stern, and came upon the unsuspecting islanders unawares. The canoes made off, and were chased. McNeil, who was in the boat, when close to one, fired his rifle at a native, who fell pierced through the left breast. The jury found McNeil guilty of wilful murder; and the Chief Justice, in pronouncing sentence of death against him, said that the evidence of guilt had been completely satisfactory to his mind. The efficacy of the law had thus been fully established. The 'interesting' nature of the trial was not impaired by what took place after it was over. The usual clamour heard when a ruffian is likely to meet with his deserts was raised in the colony. To this the Governor yielded, and commuted the punishment of death to one of imprisonment.

It may be some alleviation of the shame and sorrow which Englishmen must feel on reading such stories as those just related, to find that the other two European nations that have interests in the South-western Pacific are not in a position to cast stones at us. The French New Caledonian labour trade, while it lasted, and the German, carried on for the

* 'Times,' January 28, 1885.

service of the plantations in Samoa, were but little better than that conducted under the British flag. Taken as a whole, and considering the absence of supervision, not only during the 'recruiting,' but also during the employment of the labourers on the plantations, the German trade has probably been even more disastrous to the islanders than the English. Whatever superiority over the latter the German or the French trade may have had was due simply to their relatively much smaller extent. We speak from personal knowledge when stating, that the natives of islands where the labour vessels of both nations were well known shunned those under the German flag much more anxiously than they did the vessels under our own. In the official 'Report of Inquiry,' to which reference has been made, suggestions as to the better regulation of the trade have been put forward. As far as we know, none have as yet been acted on. If the business is to be continued on anything like the atrocious system followed, as we have shown, up to a recent date, its ultimate cessation cannot be far distant. The goose that lays the golden eggs will have been killed. The labour traders will simply use up all the available natives of Oceania, and there will be none left to supply the places of those who fall victims to the mode of 'trading' above described. We believe that it is possible, and not very difficult, to introduce a system which would remove most of the objections to it—which would certainly rob it of all its horrors. Whether such a system will be adopted or not is worthy of inquiry.

'The need of labour,' says Baron Hübner, 'forms the principal element in what will become, at no distant date, the "Pacific Question."' In default of the islanders, he believes that there will be the Chinese to fall back upon; but then the Chinaman costs more, and ends by ousting the white. The preservation of the native races, whose diminution is hastened by the labour trade, is of vital importance to the white settlers in Oceania. England has attempted to protect the islanders, but not very successfully. Certain alterations in the law have been recommended, but it is doubtful if these, should they be made, will effect much. We concur with Baron Hübner in thinking that the only remedy is to be looked for in some international agreement, 'the terms of which should apply to all mankind living or moving in the archipelagoes or regions of the Western Pacific.' The precedent of Apia in Samoa is encouraging. That town and the immediate neighbourhood are governed

by a municipal board under the joint supervision of the consuls of Great Britain, Germany, and the United States. It still forms part of the dominions of the King of Samoa, but the administration is in the hands of the municipality and the consuls. Rates are levied, a police force is maintained, a magistrate's court has been established, bylaws dealing with sanitary matters, the harbour, licenses, &c., have been drawn up, and the result is an orderly and fairly prosperous settlement. In New Guinea and those portions of Oceania which have been annexed by, or declared under the protection of, Great Britain, Germany, and Spain, many of the difficulties in the way of preserving order will disappear. Laws suitable to each locality can be made, and may be enforced on all, independently of nationality. The constitutional experiment under trial in the Tongan or Friendly Islands should be watched with benevolent interest. The King and his ex-missionary premier should be given to understand that we desire the success of the experiment, that we will gladly lend any reasonable help towards that end, and that all we insist on in return is fair play for our fellow-countrymen engaged in commerce within the limits of the kingdom. There still remain considerable groups of islands which have neither been brought under the jurisdiction of a civilised power, nor have efficient governments of their own. To these the international arrangement suggested might apply.

The trade in the products of the islands of the Western Pacific, if we except Fiji as a British colony a dozen years old, is of small amount, and is not likely to be considerably increased. Every district harassed by labour traders is practically lost to ordinary commerce, at least for a time. If the population continues to decrease at the accelerated rate caused by the system of 'recruiting,' many islands will be lost altogether. Of what use islands without inhabitants will be it is impossible to conceive. Here and there a naval power may find a convenient coaling station for its fleet, but it will be put to the expense and inconvenience of maintaining it and providing for its defence. When a naval force distributes itself naturally, that is, when sufficient portions of it are found where there are adequate interests to protect, there is a strategic fitness in establishing stations of supply near the line of its operations, however remote. To form depôts at distant points for the service of a fleet, the first strategic principle of which should be concentration near home, in order that some minute interest may have a chance

of being protected, is simply to invite a dangerous dislocation of the fleet's divisions. It is, therefore, improbable that any continental country, unless it be France, who has already in Oceania possessions that she would not care to abandon, will form stations of the kind in the Western Pacific.

It is quite possible to possess an island in need of supervision, and yet to supervise it only so fitfully as to do more mischief than if it were systematically forgotten. There are few more interesting passages of Baron Hübner's book than that in which he gives an account of his visit to Norfolk Island. He found the immigrants from Pitcairn's Island, whom it is the fashion alternately to pet and to neglect, huddling together in little cottages rather than repair those that had fallen into ruin. The lemon trees, planted by the convicts nearly a century ago, were in danger of being overgrown by the ever-encroaching bush, owing to the carelessness of the inhabitants. The oranges had so deteriorated from want of care that the fruit had become tasteless. Even the animals were degenerating from not being properly looked after. The lack of energy in the population was unquestionable.

'Nearly everything here in the shape of buildings, roads, or plantations dates from the time of the penal settlement, and is the work of the convicts. The Pitcairners have made or preserved very little. . . . To sum up, certain benevolent men, under the impulse of generous feelings, wished to undertake the part of Providence towards them. They lavished kindnesses on this people, who are certainly worthy of interest. But in separating them absolutely from the rest of the world they created for them an artificial existence. There is no competition, and consequently no emulation or incitement to work; the blood never gets renewed, and, as a final consequence, the population falls into a lethargic state, which is threatening to lead them to moral and physical degradation. This philanthropic experiment has met with ill success. I doubt whether it will be repeated.' (Vol. ii. pp. 273-275.)

This is the result of injudicious spoiling, and nearly as injudicious neglect, of a community whose loyalty to the Queen, Mr. Romilly asserts, is not exceeded in any other part of her dominions.

We ought to keep Norfolk Island in remembrance whenever we turn our thoughts to New Guinea. In that country we have assumed responsibilities which it will perhaps be hazardous, which it will certainly be discreditable, to disregard. We went there uninvited by the natives. They would have greatly preferred our absence; but as, to suit

our own purposes, we have chosen to go amongst them, we are bound by every principle of honour to see that they suffer no harm from our arrival. We shall greatly increase the difficulties which already hamper us in every step we take in the Western Pacific, if we permit the scenes that have disgraced the intercourse of white men with the New Hebrides or the Solomon Islanders to be repeated close to the border of territory under the protection of the European State with whose dominions our own are now for the first time continuous. On the other hand, if we administer the affairs of our new acquisition in the spirit that best suits the circumstances, there is every hope that New Guinea will be orderly and prosperous and self-supporting. With the exception of a single trader at Port Moresby and the missionaries, there is not a white man settled in the country, except the few who may have gone thither since the declaration of the protectorate and in defiance of prohibitory warnings. We have, therefore, no 'vested interests,' based on spoliation of the inhabitants, to respect. We may consequently introduce a system of government that will not be complicated by the clash of White avidity with Papuan rights. Readers will observe the use of the phrase 'We may;' for it is by no means certain that we shall adopt any government of the kind.

At last the opportunity has been given to us of showing that Englishmen can occupy the country of uncivilised tribes without despoiling or exterminating them. In New Guinea we have a vast territory, many natives, and no 'superior' race' whose predatory instincts have to be reckoned with. We can begin, so to speak, with a clean page. That the inhabitants are not unfriendly was abundantly proved by their reception of Commodore Erskine and his squadron when the protectorate was proclaimed a year and a half ago. The assistance of the missionaries, Messrs. Lawes and Chalmers, was, of course, invaluable; and the success of the delicate operation was due, in no inconsiderable degree, to their beneficent influence. In a strange country, many of the inhabitants of which were unfamiliar with white men, throughout many leagues of coast there was not a single unpleasant occurrence during the visits of a large squadron with hundreds of sailors and marines. This unexampled experience was to be attributed chiefly to the tact of the Commodore and the perfection of the discipline that he maintained. It shows, at the least, that amongst Queen Victoria's 'white chiefs' there are men who can deal sensibly and justly with barbarian islanders.

The resources of New Guinea will be best developed by the protection of the natives against the speculator, who regards their rights but lightly. The natives may be taught by judiciously chosen officials to work out their civilisation by themselves. The astonishing results achieved by the two devoted missionaries named above proves that this is quite possible. An early object of our policy should be the exclusion of white strangers from the country till the inhabitants are more able to meet them on a nearly equal footing, as regards the ordinary transactions of commerce or agriculture, than they are at present. Mr. Romilly has a few remarks, bearing more or less directly on this matter, which deserve attention :—

‘As has always been the case with new and unknown countries, extravagant reports have been industriously circulated as to the vegetable and mineral wealth of the interior and the rapid fortunes which could be made in it. An enormous country like New Guinea must present every variety of soil and climate; and while in some places, such as Astrolabe Bay, the richest tropical vegetation may be seen, in others, such as Port Moresby, nothing but pandanus, eucalyptus, and coarse grass will grow. In the latter place even the cocoanut is a failure. It is fair to assume that so mountainous a country as New Guinea is rich in minerals, but as yet we have yet no proof that it is so in any part of it.’ (Romilly, pp. 236, 237.)

The labours of the missionaries in the Western Pacific have done much to redeem the character of the white men who frequent its waters. The higher races, the so-called Polynesians, or, in the new jargon of ethnology, the Sa-wai-ori,* are all credited with conversion to Christianity. The effect on their beliefs has undoubtedly been immense; the effect on their morals has been lamentably inferior. Attendance at church, fervour in the singing of hymns, recklessness in responding to a missionary's demands for subscriptions, may tell well in a report to be circulated among the supporters of the mission at a distance; but they will not blind the visitor, who observes on the spot, to the real moral condition of the islanders. The more savage the race to whose elevation the missionary gives up his life, the more wonderful and the more beneficial is the result. Much is gained if cannibalism is put down and the cruel tribal wars are stopped. The missionaries have done more than this. Wherever the mission station can be discerned in the archipelagoes of Melanesia, there the white voyager knows that he may land in safety and unarmed.

* A compound of Sa-moa, Ha-waii (Sandwich Islands), and Ma-ori.

It would be impossible to adjudge the superiority to any one of the sects which are represented in the mission field in Oceania. The devotion of the Roman Catholic missionaries is unsurpassed; indeed it would scarcely be invidious to say that it is unequalled. They give up everything, home, country, family, to spend all their lives amongst their barbarian flocks. They ask nothing from their converts, and live as poorly as they. It is not easy to explain why it is that they are much less successful than the Protestants. Yet it is certain that it is so. A Roman Catholic mission was tried in the New Hebrides and failed. Another was tried in New Britain, and that also failed. It was the same in the Ellice group. In every one of the places named the Protestants have succeeded. Even in Samoa and Tonga, where the natural disposition of the natives would seem to incline them irresistibly to stately and ornate ceremonies, the Catholic Christians are but a fraction of those that belong to the other sects. Baron Hübner says that the French nationality of most of the priests sometimes gives rise to erroneous impressions amongst the English authorities where such exist. We differ from him altogether in the view that the impressions are 'erroneous.' French clergy, proscribed in their own country, are petted by the Government of the Republic in Oceania. A French man-of-war is annually placed at the disposal of the bishop to convey him through his diocese. Even in Fiji a man-of-war takes the Apostolic Prefect from Levuka to Suva, between which there is frequent communication by ordinary steamer. The English officials in Fiji are not the men to attach undue importance to this; but they have to remember the people whom they govern. Among these latter tribal divisions and tribal feelings are still active; and the old principle, mentioned by Baron Hübner in another part of his work—*cujus regio, ejus et religio*—has not altogether lost its hold on the native mind. Ostentatious support given by a government to the missionaries of its nation is very likely to be misunderstood by the islanders.

The condition of the Western Pacific is a matter of nearer concern to us than it seems to be generally considered. To begin with, there are more than three millions of Englishmen in the Australasian colonies whose prospects must be involved in the condition of the neighbouring regions. This will continue to be true, though they may make mistakes, as they have already made mistakes, concerning the mode in which their interests would be best secured. The first

Australian interest in the Western Pacific is the maintenance of order. It is impossible that our fellow subjects on the other side of the line can derive all the advantage from the South Seas that their energy and enterprise give them a right to expect, so long as the present anarchy prevails. The truth of this has been actually proved. When New Caledonia was merely one of a score of Melanesian cannibal islands, its neighbourhood in no way benefited Australia. But since it has been occupied by a civilised power, notwithstanding that it is a foreign power, Nouméa, the capital, has become simply a commercial outpost of the Australian colonies. It is probably no exaggeration to say that four-fifths of the profits on trade in New Caledonia find their way into the pockets of British subjects. So fully admitted is this by those who are in a position to know the facts, that it has been stated upon good evidence that Englishmen, more than Frenchmen, really desire to see the New Hebrides annexed to France.

It is not to be supposed that our fellow countrymen at the antipodes would bear with patience the establishment of additional penal settlements, imperfectly supervised, in their neighbourhood. Though we may believe that their fear of the consequences is exaggerated, we cannot think any the worse of them for being afraid of what may happen. There is lawlessness enough in the South Seas as it is, and it would probably be immensely aggravated were a few thousand ill-guarded ruffians to be scattered about the groups of islands. But surely any chance of this being done may be averted by suitable diplomatic means and by becoming recognition of the rights and the dignity of other nations. Every Pacific island that is changed into an orderly possession of a civilised nation, no matter which, will help the progress and make for the good of Australia and New Zealand. If foreign countries choose to incur the expense and responsibility of acquiring remote possessions from which our fellow subjects are to derive all the real advantage, what wisdom is there in the policy that would forbid them?

The commerce of the Western Pacific islands is, as we have before remarked, not great in itself and not capable of considerable expansion. The most successful of the Hamburg traders who traffic amongst its archipelagoes are those who have no competition to face. It is strange, and not easy to explain, that English trade in the South Seas should gain at the expense of its rivals, even where they have every apparent advantage on their side. The real reason of the recent annexations by Germany seems to be the hope, che-

rished at Hamburg and at its dependent trading stations in the Western Pacific, that where the imperial flag may fly there will reign a commercial policy excluding foreign competition. Of course we could not contemplate with equanimity the prospect of regions brought to the knowledge of the civilised world by the activity and skill of our explorers being locked against our commerce. But we do not think that this is likely to happen, and if it did the history of German trade in Samoa tells us that in the end we should still have our share of the gains. Though, as Baron Hübner informs us, the trade of Samoa is principally in the hands of German houses, yet 'most of the goods imported 'are of foreign, that is to say not German, origin.' This is only a roundabout way of saying—what is known to be the case—that their origin is English. Our policy in the Western Pacific should have one object—the abolition of anarchy in its archipelagoes. In our opinion the way to compass this is by international agreement.

Since these pages were written a very important step has been made in the direction of that international agreement which we have advocated, by the publication of the Declaration between the Governments of Great Britain and the German Empire relating to the demarcation of the British and German spheres of influence in the Western Pacific, which was signed by Count Herbert Bismarck and Sir Edward Malet at Berlin on April 6, and we cordially welcome this proof that a complete and cordial understanding exists between the two Powers on this debateable ground. The Declaration defines a strict line of demarcation, traced from point to point on the Admiralty chart, and provides that neither Power shall make acquisitions of territory, or accept protectorates, or interfere with the extension of influence within the area reserved to the other State. A second Declaration secures to the subjects of each Power entire freedom and equality of trade, commerce, settlement, and the acquisition of land or other property within the boundaries of the other. Disputed claims to land are to be settled by a mixed Commission. This liberal and judicious convention fulfils to a remarkable extent the hopes we expressed in concluding this article. It substitutes a joint and mutual agreement for a dangerous rivalry between the subjects of the two Powers, and it establishes a control which may, we trust, prove effectual to maintain the authority of civilised nations over anarchy and crime, even in the almost unexplored regions of the Western Pacific.

ART. IV.—*The Apostolic Fathers: S. Ignatius, S. Polycarp.*
Revised Texts, with Introductions, Notes, Dissertations,
and Translations. By J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L.,
LL.D., Bishop of Durham. London: 1885.

NOTHING can be lost, and very much must be gained, by an examination of every document belonging, or professing to belong, to the first two centuries of Christian history. The problem, which is the goal of all such inquiries, is indeed a momentous one, for it is concerned with the most astonishing and the most far-reaching change that has ever been effected in the world. The assertion that this problem has thus far received an adequate solution would savour much more of rashness than of wisdom. That Christianity has achieved incomparably the greatest of all revolutions in the religious developement of man, no one probably will dream of questioning. How is this revolution to be accounted for? In some way or other, between the fall of the Roman Republic and the age of the Antonines, a new force entered and made itself felt, and most assuredly wrought in an almost incredibly short time effects different in kind from any which the world had thus far witnessed. For centuries, if indeed we must not say for millenniums, even the most civilised races and tribes had exhibited a deadly monotony of grossly selfish and cruel vice, in contrast with certain so-called virtues which brought with them little of benefit except to the few who had leisure enough and wealth enough to practise them. Further, this dead level of horrible impurity, of cynical delight in spreading corruption or inflicting misery, marked the history of the world in ages during which men filled with burning hatred of wrong were lifting up their voices, in an obscure corner of the earth, against this mighty mass of iniquity. Yet during all these centuries the words, the teaching, the example of the long line of Hebrew prophets had on the world beyond the borders of their own land made little impression or none; and it was just when men seemed to be sinking down in utter exhaustion under the burden of wanton injustice, and in the deadly torpor of a foul brutality, that an attack was for the first time made on this kingdom of evil.

The leaven thus introduced worked on steadily. The seed sown produced its fruits; but the mode in which it grew and the forms which the plant assumed are matters of

infinite importance, and yet are subjects of a strange diversity of opinion. The Christian literature of the first century indicates with sufficient clearness one state of things; that of the second seems to point to the introduction of elements of a very different character; while in the records of the third and fourth we see the developement of a constitution which is on one side regarded as the necessary outgrowth of the earliest Christian teaching, while on another it is looked upon as evidence of its distortion or its corruption. Whence came this change which slowly or rapidly led the way to the hierarchical and imperial constitution of Latin Christendom? The danger of such inquiries lies in the difficulty of resisting the temptation to frame pictures of an imaginary past; and the passion for transferring to the past the peculiarities of later times may be best corrected by keeping in view the total unlikeness of the first, second, or third centuries to anything which now exists in any part of the world.

Such an utterance, it may be said, is a prejudging of the question. At the least it stands out in marked contrast with the main argument of some theologians of the Roman Church, and of Cardinal Newman in particular. The theory of developement in the Latin sense receives a deathblow if it cannot be shown that in the Christendom of the first three centuries the Latin Catholic would have found himself entirely at home, while the Protestant of whatever school would have been rejected as an alien or an enemy. The force with which this argument was wielded at Oxford half a century ago may be remembered still. It was, we were assured, 'impossible to conceive that the mediæval system could have been developed out of a state of things quite 'dissimilar.' The plea is soon disposed of. It is, in truth, the fundamental fallacy of the ecclesiastical theory; and the rapidity with which out of a state of things entirely opposite a religious system claiming to be its genuine successor may grow up, is illustrated, as Dean Stanley remarks, in the history of the Society of Friends, and in the uprising of the 'Catholic and Apostolic Church' with its hierarchy and liturgy out of the bald Presbyterianism and excited utterances of Edward Irving and his companions.

It is precisely this question which invests with a singular interest the story of Ignatius, and renders the genuineness or the falsity of the literature which bears or has gathered round his name matters of the highest moment. That literature carries us back to a time not later than the reign of Trajan.

Christianity has been at work in the empire for something like sixty years at the least ; and the attitude of the empire towards it is, taken by itself, a fact calling for serious consideration. The message with which the Apostles of Christ were charged was one for all the world. The teaching of their Master called on them to cry aloud on the housetops, in the marketplace, in the streets, and in the lanes ; and yet the Christian Church was treated as a secret society, and its members were liable at any time to the infliction of the penalties always hanging over the members of illegal associations.

Into a society thus removed, in Bishop Lightfoot's words, from 'the steadying influence of the two great classical 'peoples, especially of the Romans,' we are introduced by the strange story of the martyrdom of Ignatius. In the life of this striking personage we are acquainted literally with this one scene only, and the conjectures as to his previous history are merely inferences from expressions in the letters written on his way to death at Rome. From these expressions it may perhaps be safely concluded that he was not a Christian during his earlier years, and that he fell into some of the thousand vices of heathen society against which Christianity was waging war. The remembrance of time thus abused leads him to apply to himself some of the severest phrases in which St. Paul bewails his persecution of the faith for which he afterwards lived and died. But apart from the half light thus thrown upon it, the life of Ignatius is wrapped in a 'pitchy darkness,' broken only as we come to the closing scene ; and in this scene we see him suddenly and summarily condemned to die in the Flavian amphitheatre. We hear of no one else as accused or sentenced with him, although there is just the possibility that there may have been such ; we do not know what circumstances broke the peace of the church at Antioch, or what may have been the charge which was brought against its bishop. What is certain is, that he exercised no right of appeal ; in fact, that he possessed none, not being a Roman citizen. Appeal from the sentence was, however, the last thing that he desired, and his letter to the Romans is filled with passionate entreaties that none may do him the cruel kindness of hindering the consummation by which alone he can become really a disciple. Gibbon speaks of this epistle as breathing sentiments the most repugnant to the ordinary feelings of human nature ; but there are times and occasions in which these feelings must be resolutely set aside, and

this may have been one of them. We may doubt the wisdom and regret the seeming extravagance of his language, but it is no difficult matter to trace the working of his thoughts on the great duty of bearing witness to the faith. The great Roman arena will be a better battlefield than any which could be furnished by his own Syrian city; and he is resolved to do all that mortal man can to make the sacrifice complete. If the beasts do not rush upon him, he will rush upon them, and will compel them to crush his body or tear it into fragments. His longing is that their teeth may grind his bones to powder, that so they may be as the finest wheat flour for an offering to God. His blood shall be a libation for the altar; and when it shall have been so poured forth he will have attained to the blessedness of true discipleship.

From Antioch, therefore, he must be taken to Rome; but how the earlier part of the journey was accomplished we cannot say. Whether by land or sea, he travelled in the custody of a maniple or band of ten soldiers, of whom he speaks as ten leopards. At Smyrna he was hospitably received by the bishop Polycarp, and this fact seems not altogether to prove the ferocity of his guards. Nay, further, he was welcomed by deputations from Tralles, Magnesia, and Ephesus, and he was enabled to write letters to all those churches, a fourth being written to the church at Rome. We next find him at Alexandria Troas, where more friends gathered to greet him, and from this place he wrote three more letters, two being addressed to the churches of Philadelphia and Smyrna, the third to the Bishop of Smyrna, Polycarp. At Philippi the number of victims destined for the arena was enlarged, two (Zosimus and Rufus) being mentioned by name; but of these we know nothing. As he had done to others, so to the Philippians Ignatius made the request that they would write to the brethren at Antioch. Carefully complying with this charge, the Philippians besought Polycarp to send them copies of any letters which he, or the church over which he presided, had received from Ignatius; and not impossibly it is to this circumstance that we owe the preservation of the genuine letters of Ignatius, if any such there be.

With this record of his sojourn at Philippi the darkness thus broken only for a moment falls again on the career of Ignatius. But the variation of treatment, sometimes harsh, sometimes by comparison kind, would seem to have marked his journey to its close. The deputations which greeted him at the several halting places rather resembled ovations in

welcome of a conqueror than gatherings for solemn farewell to one whose earthly days were numbered; nor apparently was there much to set off against this general leniency beyond the chain which tied him to his guardian, unless we take into account hard pallets and rough fare, for which Ignatius would care nought.

Is there any part of this strange story credible? and can any portion of the many records which profess to relate to it be received as trustworthy? For the negative conclusion two sets of arguments have been urged, the one resting on the inherent improbability or impossibility of the incidents in the tale, the other on the internal evidence of the martyr's letters. The former dismiss as fiction the narrative of a journey of thousands of miles for the sake of throwing an aged man to bears or tigers. The latter treat as spurious all the epistles which bear his name, on the plea that they depict a degree of ecclesiastical developement such as it is held that the Christian Church could not possibly have reached at the beginning of the second century.

To these two problems the Bishop of Durham has addressed himself; and in the whole range of English literature few works can be found which handle a subject bristling with points of almost fierce controversy more ably, more patiently, more impartially, and more exhaustively. The task before him was not merely the showing that the narrative of the martyrdom is neither impossible nor unlikely; nor was it confined to the mere separation of genuine from spurious or forged matter. The records or professed records have come down to us in various forms. Is the shortest in each case to be looked upon as the original? They have been handed down to us in different languages. Are we to suppose that a briefer version is to be received as the oldest because it is found in the ruder dialect of a more remote country? and are all the letters not included in this version to be on this ground alone summarily cast aside? This brief outline of the Tübingen, Curetonian, and other controversies may serve to indicate the tortuousness of the labyrinth through which the Bishop of Durham has had to clear his way. Whatever may be the conclusions hereafter reached on some of the many points in debate, there can be no question that the whole evidence is here brought before the reader with consummate skill and with a judicial dispassionateness which is never ruffled. But in works so planned and executed there must always be a temptation to say too much rather than too little; and the critical method of the Bishop of Durham has

not always been proof against this temptation. Lack of time may, and indeed must, be pleaded for arrangements which have caused dislocations of matter that might otherwise have been avoided. For weeks and sometimes for months during the past seven years the author tells us that he failed to find time for writing a single line; and the same stress of work made it necessary to pass the second volume through the press for the most part before the first, the latter parts often proceeding side by side. We are thus referred frequently from the first volume to the second, or from earlier to later chapters of the first, for different portions of the same subject. But it may be enough to say that the work addresses itself necessarily to students and scholars, who will appreciate rightly the difficulties of the task, and will make all due allowances for defects of arrangement, which after all add little to the labour of the reader, and for which exhaustiveness of treatment is an ample compensation.

The credibility or likelihood of the Ignatian story as a narrative of facts may be dealt with at no great length. The tendency of more recent criticism has been to deny the reality of most of the persecutions assigned to the first and second centuries; the desire of Gibbon was to minimise them, or to prove that the sufferings of the Christians by no means matched their ill deserts, or their irrational and childish obstinacy. But it is curious to mark how far this wish leads the historian to warp or to invert facts, and to leave out of sight others with which we can scarcely suppose him to have been unacquainted. No judgement can be passed on the story of the martyrdom of Ignatius, unless we first deal with the records, such as we have them, of the contemporary persecution in Bithynia; and in speaking of the latter Gibbon seems to feel himself on firm ground. With astonishing confidence he bids us 'assure ourselves that when he [Pliny] accepted the government of Bithynia, there were no general laws or decrees of the senate against the Christians; that neither Trajan nor any of his virtuous predecessors, whose edicts were received into the civil and criminal jurisprudence, had publicly declared their intentions concerning the new sect; and that whatever proceedings had been carried on against the Christians, there were none of sufficient weight and authority to establish a precedent for the conduct of a Roman magistrate.'* It is strange, indeed, that

* Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, c. xvi.

a flimsy cobweb should be treated as solid argument. If the case were as Gibbon represents it, we might ask how Pliny came to concern himself with the Christians at all, and still more, how, if there were neither law nor senatorial decree nor imperial edict relating to the matter, this young officer should dare on his own authority to sentence men to death for an undefined offence without having first consulted his master. He asks the emperor's directions, it is true, for the future; but he distinctly says that he had already condemned to death all those who, being accused of Christianity, had refused to abjure it at his bidding. If we cannot believe that Gibbon did not know, we must conclude that he found it convenient to forget the attitude first of the Roman republic, and then of the Roman empire, to all unrecognised and unauthorised religions, no matter what might be their character. The shutting of his eyes to this fact vitiates the whole train of his reasoning on the circumstances determining the growth and spread of Christianity. With the Romans every religion was unlawful until it received a direct and explicit sanction from the State. Special edicts and decrees would, therefore, be in no way called for to make the profession of Christianity as much a penal offence as the profession of Judaism. For a time, as it so happens, the profession of the former was confused with that of the latter; and all that the issuing of a special edict against the Christians would do would be to divert upon them the persecution which might otherwise have been directed against the Jews. It may, therefore, be true, as some have held, that no edict was issued against the Christians before the rescript sent by Trajan in answer to Pliny's inquiries; but, for all this, during the previous forty or fifty years they were liable at any moment to persecution, and the absence of persecution was due to the carelessness, or sound sense, or humanity of the Roman magistrates. A closer inspection of these documents upsets the misconceptions of modern critics. Dr. Lightfoot insists rightly that the correspondence between Trajan and Pliny betrays no sign that any new policy was introduced at this period.

‘Neither in the appeal of the provisional governor nor in the reply of the emperor is there any—even the faintest—suggestion that Christianity now for the first time was promoted to the unenviable distinction of an unlawful religion. On the contrary, the impression left by the correspondence is that, so far as the law itself was concerned, the Christians continued to be regarded now as they had been regarded heretofore, but that the humane and upright characters of the emperor

and his servant secured some mitigation in the enforcement of the law.' (Vol. i. p. 13.)

We are thus confronted with the statement which insists with so much complacency that from the time of Nero to that of Trajan the Christian Church enjoyed a continuous peace, broken only for a moment by the last of the Flavian emperors. The truth is that the statement may possibly be right, but it is unwarranted. We do not know that the laws lay dormant and unenforced during the whole of this period. Our information with respect to these early ages of the church is, Bishop Lightfoot warns us, 'singularly defective and capricious.'

'Hilary of Poitiers ranks Vespasian between Nero and Decius as a persecutor of the faith. What may be the ground of this exceptional notice in the Gallican father we do not know. Possibly it may be an error. More probably it is based on some facts known to Hilary, but since obliterated by time from the permanent records of his day. It is no answer to this view to allege that Melito by his silence exempts Vespasian from the list of persecutors, for Melito equally exempts Trajan and Antoninus Pius, though a fierce persecution raged in Bithynia under the former, and though Polycarp and his fellow martyrs suffered in Smyrna under the latter. Neither, again, is it of any avail to insist that Tertullian in direct words exculpates this emperor from any share in the sufferings of the Christians, for Tertullian not only expressly exculpates M. Aurelius, but even ranks him among the protectors of the Gospel, though the arenas of Vienna and Lyons were watered with the blood of martyrs executed in his reign. The fact is that no systematic record was kept of the persecutions. The knowledge possessed by each individual writer was accidental and fragmentary.' (Vol. i. p. 16.)

If we had to rely only on Christian documents we should know nothing of the Bithynian persecution. Our knowledge of it comes from Pliny and Trajan, and from these only; and what they tell us looks like the record of a systematic attempt to crush out a superstition which was regarded as menacing the stability or the existence of the State.

Thus carefully and exhaustively Dr. Lightfoot sifts the whole of the evidence which bears directly or indirectly on the subject. There is no anxiety to parade highly coloured pictures, and no disposition to withdraw from ground where a footing may be made good. He is quite ready to allow that when the law against secret associations was enforced it was often or sometimes, as in the case of Ignatius, enforced against a single individual only; but he insists not less boldly that if large deductions are to be made for Christian

exaggeration on the one side, very considerable additions are probably due in compensation for the silence of Christian tradition on the other. A proof of this is found in the Bithynian persecution, about which our information, as we have seen, comes from heathen sources only, and from the testimony of the chief actors in the movement.

This fact, if it be one, is so striking, and at first sight so bewildering, that we can at least understand why some should have been tempted into questioning the genuineness of the letters which passed between Pliny and Trajan on the treatment of Christians. But the objection goes too far, and the argument proves too much. No one questions the rest of the correspondence, and the unquestioned portions contain matter not less startling and bewildering than that of these more celebrated letters. Pliny himself, owing to a great fire in Nicomedia which had found the citizens wholly unprepared, suggests the formation of a company of a hundred and fifty men to be provided with apparatus for the extinction of fires, and to be systematically disciplined for their work. Trajan starts at the mere mention of a guild of workmen, and bids Pliny remember that the city and the province were already harassed by party associations of that kind. Whatever may be the purpose of Pliny's suggested organisation, the men so brought together will form themselves into clubs all the same. The emperor bids him, therefore, content himself with providing the proper apparatus for the extinction of fires, at the same time warning the owners of estates to be on their guard against such accidents. If fires break out, the people generally may be mustered to help in putting them out.

From the inhabitants of Amisa, a free city under a special treaty, Pliny received a petition in reference to certain gatherings for a subscription supper. To Pliny's question on the subject Trajan replies that he will not interfere with the free action which may be secured to them by treaty, so long as the contributions are employed not for making disturbances or unlawful assemblages, but to support the needs of the poorer members; but he adds that in all cities not protected by treaties everything of the sort must be prohibited and put down.

Precautions such as these may seem to us to savour of the very extravagance of childish and unreasoning apprehension. But dangers hidden from our eyes may have assumed large proportions in theirs; and it is certain that these fears, whatever may have been the exciting cause, were wholly

political. Pliny had not the least idea that he was resisting the advancement of the Divine Kingdom, or trying to repress a religion which would one day be the religion of the empire, or fighting against the truth, or even hindering the promotion of sober and moral living. He listened probably with some satisfaction to the statements of Christians that it was their desire and their duty to abstain from theft, robbery, and adultery, from breach of their word, and from the withholding of a deposit when reclaimed; but his jealousy would be roused by hearing that they were bound to this duty by an oath, and that, after the daily renewal of this pledge, they met together for an ordinary and harmless meal. Even this common meal was given up, we are told, after the issuing of the *proprætor's* edict forbidding the existence of clubs. As a political association, and as such alone, the Christian Church was distinguished by Trajan from the Jewish community, and Christianity was declared to be an unlawful religion. It had all along lain under the ban laid by Roman legislation on '*hetæriæ*,' or clubs. '*Non licet esse vos*,' was the emphatic maxim; the law does not sanction your existence.

This alone should surely suffice to attest the genuineness of the two letters relating directly to the Christians. Bishop Lightfoot says rightly that the objections urged against them scarcely deserve serious refutation. In style and character they are in full harmony with the rest. But more particularly

'The confessedly spurious documents relating to this reign . . . paint the emperor and his subordinates in the darkest colours, which contrast strongly with the studious moderation and the inherent sense of justice here attributed to them. Again, what Christian writer, if bent on a forgery, and therefore unfettered by any scruples of veracity, would have confessed that crowds of his fellow believers had denied their faith, that all alike had abandoned their *agapæ* at the bidding of a heathen magistrate, that the persecution was already refilling the heathen temples, and that there was good hope (if the same policy was pursued) of a general apostasy ensuing? What Christian writer could have so far restrained himself as not only to be silent about bishops and priests, about sects and heresies, about the doctrines of the faith, but even to betray those misapprehensions or half-apprehensions which appear in such expressions as "*se sacramento obstringere*," "*ad capiendum cibum*," "*duabus ancillis quæ ministræ dicebantur*"?' (Vol. i. p. 55.)

But if this correspondence between Pliny and Trajan must be accepted as genuine, the supposed inherent unlikelihood

of the Ignatian martyrdom vanishes. We may be perplexed to say why the peace of the Antiochene Church should be suddenly disturbed, why the storm should pass away after striking down seemingly one victim only, and why this victim should be sent thousands of miles for execution. It is enough to know that cases like that of Ignatius were by no means isolated, and were not confined to the professors either of Christianity or of Judaism. It is abundantly clear from the admissions of Pliny and his master that their fears of secret associations were intensely, if not morbidly, excited; and there may have been causes for this which neither of them cared much to particularise. With Dean Milman the conviction deepened with increasing years, that the persecution in Bithynia and at Antioch was local or rather Asiatic, 'arising out of the vigilant and not groundless apprehension of the sullen and brooding preparations for insurrection among the whole Jewish race (with whom Roman terror and hatred still confounded the Christians) which broke out in the bloody massacres of Cyrene and Cyprus, and in the final rebellion during the reign of Hadrian under Barcochebas.* Nor can we deny that, though the difference between Jew and Christian must even then have been sufficiently striking, still with the latter as with the former, in Dean Milman's words, 'the unusual assertion of religious might be too closely allied with that of political independence; † and the blow which, prompted by such fears, struck down the head of a community, might fall at any moment on its meanest members. But in the long journey to Rome, as well as in the closing scene, there is much that may be repulsive to modern feeling, but nothing which is at all unlikely. On this point the remarks of Bishop Lightfoot are decisive. Modern critics in raising and multiplying difficulties forget the enormous trouble and outlay spent on the costly and bloody spectacles provided for the amusement of the Roman populace. The second Dacian triumph of Trajan was followed by games lasting for a hundred and twenty-three days, during which time 10,000 gladiators fought, and about 11,000 wild and tame beasts were slaughtered. To these must be added the bands of criminals whom these beasts used to tear and devour before they were done to death themselves. No small exertions must have been needed on the part of provincial governors

* Latin Christianity, bk. i. c. i.

† History of Christianity, bk. iii. c. vi.

to supply these ghastly hecatombs of men and beasts; and unhappily in records so little embellished by fancy as the Digests, we have ample corroboration for the picture of 'companies of soldiers, like those who guarded Ignatius, 'converging from all quarters of the empire to Rome, and 'bringing thither their several contingents of victims whom 'they had gathered on their route.'

But modern criticism or sentiment stumbles at the ten leopards, against whose violence Ignatius utters some passing complaints. The objections thus raised may be worth little, but the answers to them lead to conclusions which go far towards settling the whole Ignatian controversy; and the thoroughness as well as the patience with which Dr. Lightfoot treats them must strike every reader. The objections imply that the soldiers had nothing to do but to guard Ignatius, who was chained to every one of them by day and by night. The picture, he retorts, is absurd. Even in the Roman empire there was not such a wealth of soldiers that ten could be spared for the custody of each individual convict. Their train of prisoners grew as they went along; and whether in their harsher or their more indulgent moods the soldiers would be guided mainly by motives of self-interest. We need not, therefore, be surprised when we are told that they allowed his Christian friends free access to the Antiochene bishop, and suffered him freely to write to them. It is true that by so doing they gave him the opportunity of disseminating the very doctrines for which he had been condemned.

'But why,' asks Dr. Lightfoot, 'should they not? To us, who are wise after the event, Ignatius is a highly important personage, as saint, and martyr, and doctor of the Church; but to his heathen contemporaries he was a mere provincial without rank or position, a religious fanatic whose delusion would soon be scattered to the winds like its thousand and one predecessors. The last idea which would have occurred to any of his guards would be that the sect of the Nazarenes would ever set its foot on the neck of imperial Rome. He had been condemned probably to gratify some popular caprice. His sole value in their eyes was as a victim for the wild beasts in the Flavian amphitheatre. Provided that he did not escape, their end was attained. And meanwhile why should they not make a little money out of the folly of these Christians? What harm in accepting a *douceur* to admit his friends and to allow him writing materials? Their superiors would connive at it. Nay, it would hardly be called conniving, when it was the recognised practice of themselves and their comrades.' (Vol. i. p. 344.)

Nor, indeed, is there any doubt that when Ignatius speaks

of his warders as being made worse instead of better by benefits bestowed upon them, he speaks of their itching palms, not of their brute strength or ferocity. The picture drawn by Ignatius is amply borne out by the description which Lucian gives of Peregrinus, the religious adventurer, who, after a profession of Christianity, immolates himself at the Olympian games. This personage is exhibited by the satirist as posing in the character of an imprisoned Christian professor, surrounded by sympathising friends or adoring devotees. Early in the morning widows and orphan children crowd before the prison doors, and bribery does everything. It obtains for him the companionship of the faithful not by day only but by night also; and secures not merely abundant bodily sustenance, but the consolation which comes from the celebration of the Divine offices. It is unnecessary, as Dr. Lightfoot rightly insists, to inquire whether this story be truth or not. 'Even if it be fictitious, the satirist plainly relates only what is likely to have occurred under the circumstances, and this is sufficient for the object which we have in view.' Nor is this the only illustration of the leniency with which prisoners, even after condemnation, were treated by Roman practice. If they were sentenced to fight with beasts, they were in due time brought into the arena; but it was in no way deemed necessary to turn the period between condemnation and execution into a time of torture. Pamphilos, the friend for whose memory the historian Eusebius cherished an intense devotion, was imprisoned for two years before he was put to death. During that time he was engaged with Eusebius in writing the Defence of Origen, and not a word is said of any hindrances placed in his way. As compared with this, the amount of work done by or for Ignatius is small.

'During a journey occupying many months,' Dr. Lightfoot remarks, 'he succeeded at two of his halting places, Smyrna and Troas, in writing seven letters in all. They were in most instances certainly, in all probably, dictated. They bear all the marks of having been written under pressure of time and with inconvenient surroundings. They are mostly expressed in short sentences. Where a long paragraph is attempted, it generally fails. The grammar is dislocated and wrecked. There is no attempt at avoiding repetitions, which a literary forger with leisure at his command would almost certainly have shunned. We could imagine that the letters after being dictated were not even read over to the author. The whole seven might have been written at two or three sittings of a few hours each. There is throughout not a single word reflecting on the prisoner's judges. There is only one sentence which speaks disparagingly of his guards.

Is there any difficulty in conceiving this sentence written during the temporary absence of his guard, or when the soldier in charge, being a Syrian or a Roman, was ignorant of the Greek language?' (Vol. i. p. 347.)

We are thus brought to the very heart of the Ignatian controversy. There is no external evidence of any kind available which calls into question the likelihood of the story of his condemnation and of this journey as related by the martyr himself. There is much which tends to corroborate and establish it. In the letters from which these particulars are gathered, there is every appearance of genuineness and no sign of forgery. Some of the writings bearing the name of Ignatius may, therefore, be regarded as genuine. But are the rest genuine? and if they are not, are they wholly or only in part spurious? This inquiry makes it necessary to examine the history of the text, and this task Dr. Lightfoot has performed with an exactness, a clearness, and a completeness which must win for him the gratitude of all earnest students. The investigation is as interesting as it is intricate; but in spite of all the names which may be arrayed against him, it must, we think, be conceded on all hands that Dr. Lightfoot has set the controversy at rest. In a certain sense it may be said to have been set at rest before. For all intents and purposes this great task had been achieved by Ussher and Voss, and their conclusions have been generally regarded as final, until the debate was reopened owing to the discoveries of Mr. Cureton. This great scholar found in the British Museum the shortest form of the Ignatian epistles which has thus far been brought to light. The shortest form known up to that time was a Syriac version of the three epistles to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans. The version edited by Mr. Cureton might have been regarded as an abbreviation of this form, which in its turn has all the look of having been shortened from some version in Greek or Latin. But Mr. Cureton was impressed with the conviction that the short Syriac form had a better title than any other to be regarded as the original form; and when he lighted on one which was shorter still, he asserted without hesitation that we had at length before us the actual form of the epistles as they came from the lips or were written by the hand of Ignatius; that all other versions were spurious; that only these three epistles could be looked upon as genuine, and therefore that the others were all forged.

In Latin and Greek the Ignatian epistles are found in two forms, which the Bishop of Durham entitles respectively the Middle and the Long forms, the Syriac being referred to as the Short form. The Latin version of the Middle form was published by Ussher in 1644; the Greek two years later by Isaac Voss. This text contains the three Syriac epistles, but in a fuller form, which leaves it to be decided whether the Syriac version is an abridgement of the Middle form, or whether the latter is amplified by the interpolation of spurious matter. With the three letters of the Syriac version it gives further the four epistles to the churches of Smyrna, Magnesia, Philadelphia, and Tralles. The third, or the Long, form, which is found also both in Greek and Latin, gives all these seven epistles with additional matter not found in the MSS. of the Middle form, and further gives with these six other letters, among these being epistles from Ignatius to the churches of Tarsus, Philippi, and his own city and see of Antioch. This version we may here set aside as wholly untrustworthy in every part where it is not in complete harmony with the version of the Middle or second form. Dr. Lightfoot, it is true, examines it and tests its claims with the patient impartiality which characterises all his work; but he has in this portion of his task no opponents. The Long form is universally condemned as spurious and forged. Nevertheless, this form was during the Middle Ages the most popular, and it had this popularity on the strength of passages which are now seen to be impudent fictions.

The explanation of this fact is to be found in theological prepossessions. Some passages in this form were held to favour the Roman supremacy, while others were supposed to maintain the Divine authority of the episcopal order. Similar motives led for a time to the still larger popularity accorded to a set of forgeries still more glaring. Among the alleged Ignatian letters of the Long recension one is found in which he addresses a certain Mary of Cassobola as *Χριστοφόρος θυγατήρ Μαρία*, *Christofera filia Maria*, the epithet being used in the same sense in which Ignatius himself is styled Theophoros, as filled with the Divine Spirit. This epithet furnished a starting point for a new correspondence in which Ignatius is made to address not only the Apostle John but the Virgin Mary, whom he asks to send him some words of assurance and consolation, and from whom he receives a reply confirming the truth of all that he had heard from St. John and exhorting him to steadfastness

in the faith. The desire for the exaltation of the Virgin-Mother thus betrayed proves this forgery to be the work of the eleventh or twelfth century, and it so fell in with the temper of the age that it came to be looked upon as the only true portion of the Ignatian literature.

But even when the coarseness and clumsiness of this imposture came to be admitted, prepossessions of a like nature continued to determine the course of opinion with regard to the letters of the Long recension. The support which they were supposed to give to the more advanced theories of episcopal government won for it the hearty approval of one side, while in the eyes of men like Calvin it was an unpardonable crime. According to the great Genevan reformer, nothing was more foul than the nursery tales put forth under the name of Ignatius, nor could the impudence of those who equipped themselves with such ghosts be exceeded. In his day, as before it, opinion could scarcely be determined in any other way; and with few exceptions the general tendency was to accept the twelve epistles of the Long recension as genuine. One striking exception was furnished by the Genevan professor, Vedelius, who printed as genuine the seven epistles mentioned by Eusebius, placing the rest as spurious in an appendix, and maintaining that even these seven epistles were weighted with a large amount of interpolated matter. Without external testimony it was impossible to go further; and the inquiry which Vedelius conducted with such scholarlike sobriety and acuteness became tarnished by the invective of irritated and excited antagonists. In his book entitled 'Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted,' Hall, Bishop of Exeter, quotes only from what he speaks of as the seven confessedly genuine letters, but he quotes from those passages which the sagacity of Vedelius had cast aside as interpolations. Two years later the five Presbyterian ministers who assumed the name Smectymnuus, from the combined initials of their names, joined in the fray. Ussher himself, at the entreaty of Bishop Hall, came forward with a tract on 'The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans,' in which he quoted from the interpolated recension, but quoted only a few passages in which it agrees with the original text. His silence on the subject of any discovery made by himself completely deceived Milton, who manifestly regarded him as one who accepted the Long recension. Passing over the passages quoted by Ussher, he fastens with true critical insight on other places which he says, 'must either be adulterate, or else Ignatius was most

‘corrupt and adulterate himself.’ Had God, he goes on to say, intended that we should seek for useful instruction from Ignatius, He would not have sent him to our hands in this broken and disjointed plight; while, ‘if He intended no such thing, we do injuriously in thinking to taste better the pure ‘evangelic manna by seasoning our mouths with the tainted ‘scraps and fragments from an unknown table.’

But the controversy was soon to pass into another phase, which Milton never looked for. Profound learning and keen critical sagacity have been seldom used to better purpose than by Archbishop Ussher. This illustrious scholar had noticed that the quotations from Ignatius in the writings of three Englishmen—Robert Grosseteste, John Tyssington, and William Wodeford—belonging to the period from the middle of the thirteenth to the end of the fourteenth centuries, agreed precisely with the quotations in the pages of Eusebius and Theodoret; in other words, that they did not agree at all with the text of the Long recension. Ussher, therefore, became convinced that there must be somewhere in England some manuscripts of a version belonging to this earlier text, from which the three Englishmen had made their citations. His search was rewarded by the discovery of two MSS., of which Dr. Lightfoot gives a very careful account, prefaced by a remark which no one will dream of disputing, that the history of this version is full of interest for all scholars, and especially for Englishmen. On seeing this Latin version, he expressed a suspicion that Grosseteste himself had translated it from the Greek; but where had Grosseteste seen this Greek text? That Grosseteste’s quotations were made from this version, there was no doubt; and the fact that some marginal notes in one of the MSS. compared the words of the translation with the original Greek, seemed to show that these notes were written down by the translator himself. One of these notes proved the writer apparently to be an Englishman—‘Incus est ‘instrumentum fabri: dicitur Anglice *anfeld* (anvil);’ and for the achievement of this task no Englishman could be named more likely than Grosseteste, one of the very few Greek scholars of the age. It is known that he caused a Latin translation to be made of the writings of the supposed Dionysios the Areopagite; and as MSS. of these writings were often bound up with those of the Ignatian epistles, it is not unlikely that the Greek original may have been brought to England by John of Basingstoke, Archdeacon of

Leicester, who studied at Athens; or by the Greek Nicolas, who became a prebendary of Lincoln. But this Greek MS. was not forthcoming in the days of Ussher, who could restore the original text only by comparing his newly found Latin version with the Greek of the Long recension, and bringing the latter into harmony with the former, chiefly by getting rid of all excrescences. But two years after the publication of Ussher's work, Isaac Voss published the Greek text of six of the seven epistles of the Middle recension from a Florentine MS., of which Ussher had heard, but of which he had vainly tried to obtain a transcript. The epistle which Voss could not publish was the letter to the Romans. The MS. was imperfect at the end; and this letter had disappeared with the Acts of the saint's martyrdom. About fifty years later, Ruinart published the complete Greek text of the Middle recension, from a MS. belonging to the Colbert collection at Paris. The editions both of Voss and Ruinart proved that Ussher, who received only six of the seven epistles mentioned by Eusebius, was mistaken in rejecting the epistle to Polycarp, which the Bishop of Durham regards as 'the best standard and the safest test of the style of Ignatius,' inasmuch as it is found in all the three recensions. It seems sufficiently severe to speak of this rejection as a blot marring the work of Ussher; but in spite of this fault, that work remains a monument, in Dr. Lightfoot's words, not only of marvellous erudition, but of the highest critical genius. In omitting the epistle to Polycarp, Ussher was led astray by the authority of Jerome, who, as Dr. Lightfoot has clearly shown, had no personal acquaintance with the writings of Ignatius.

There remain those of the Ignatian epistles which are found only in one form. Does this form belong to the Long recension? This question, like every other, is of importance in an inquiry which, if it is to separate original matter from forged interpolations and additions, must be exhaustive. Dr. Lightfoot answers the question in the affirmative with an amount of evidence which cannot easily be resisted. In character and detail these additional epistles agree closely with the language of the Long recension. Both make a large use of Scriptural texts and Scriptural examples, which are very sparingly employed in the Middle recension; in both the doctrinal complexion and nomenclature are the same; both indulge in the same literary plagiarisms; both exhibit the same general style of phraseo-

logy. A further argument against the opinion which would refer them to the Middle recension, and thus represent them as genuine, is found in the silence of Eusebius, whose words seem to have been entirely misunderstood by Mr. Cureton. This eminent scholar accounted for this silence on the ground that these additional letters contain no information respecting the episcopal succession, 'which was one of the chief objects of his history.' But there is no reason to suppose that Eusebius valued any of the epistles on this account; and it is certain that he lays the most stress on the Epistle to the Romans, which has not one word about the subject. In truth the account which Eusebius gives of the Ignatian letters is meant to be exhaustive. 'Elsewhere,' as Bishop Lightfoot insists, 'when he is acquainted with any spurious or doubtful works ascribed to the same author, he is careful to mention the fact. Here there is nothing of the kind. He enumerates the seven epistles alone; and of these he speaks without a shadow of misgiving.' But it is not with the silence of Eusebius alone that these additional epistles have to contend. The seven epistles are quoted by a long series of writers, beginning with Irenæus and Origen in the second and third centuries; the others are not noticed by any writers earlier than the close of the sixth century. The conclusion is thus abundantly established that the additional letters are the work of the same writer who interpolated the seven; and the next question is to determine when and why he set himself to this task of forgery. Here, as elsewhere, it is almost impossible to do justice to Dr. Lightfoot's method within the limits at our command. It is enough to say that in his judgement the additional matter of the Long recension cannot be placed much later than the end of the fourth century. There is nothing to suggest a later date, while the ecclesiastical status depicted in those portions of the text which are peculiar to this recension points to a time not earlier than the middle of the fourth century. The *copiatæ*, or labourers, for instance, appear amongst the lower clerical orders, and this name occurs for the first time in a rescript of Constantius, A.D. 357. More particularly this same emperor four years later speaks of them as '*hi quos copiatas recens usus instituit nuncupare.*' Evidence not less conclusive is furnished by the plagiarisms of this version; and to this must be added the evidence of its doctrinal teaching.

'The Arian and Semi-Arian, the Marcellian and Apollinarian controversies of the middle and subsequent decades of the fourth century are his main interest. On the other hand, these epistles contain nothing which suggests that the writer was acquainted with the Nestorian and Monophysite disputes of the succeeding ages. This silence is the more significant when we remember the polemical spirit of our Ignatian writer.' (Vol. i. p. 254.)

But though compiled at this time, it is not quoted by any Greek fathers for two centuries later; nor in the Greek Church did it ever displace the Middle recension.

'In the Latin Church the Long recension played a more important part. It was translated into Latin at least as early as the first half of the ninth century, and for some centuries it was without a rival in Western Christendom. Only in the thirteenth century was the Middle form translated by Grosseteste or his fellow labourers; and even then its circulation was confined to England, perhaps to the Franciscan order to which Grosseteste bequeathed his books. Yet though for several centuries the Long recension held exclusive possession of the field in the West, and though even afterwards its displacement was only local, we may suspect that its diffusion was never more than partial. It is at least a remarkable fact that nearly all the known MSS., though numerous, are of Burgundian origin. In the Syrian Church the interpolated letters of this recension seem to have remained unknown to the last.' (Vol. i. p. 261.)

It is well for the cause of historical criticism that the great achievement of Ussher has not been allowed to remain as the final word in the Ignatian controversy. His restoration of the Greek text of the Middle recension by a comparison of a Latin version with the text of the corrupt and interpolated Long recension, was immensely increased in value, when the Greek text of the Middle recension discovered by Voss at Florence appeared in corroboration of it. But as the Long recension was condemned chiefly for the forged matter which had been crowded into it, there was always the danger that the discovery of a version shorter than the Middle recension and rejecting some of the epistles included in it might lead to an onslaught on the Vossian letters similar to that which had shaken the credit of the Long recension. Ussher himself was fully aware that a Syriac version of the Ignatian letters might be brought to light. In a catalogue of books belonging to a later Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, also named Ignatius, he had noted the entry of a Syriac or Chaldee version of the letters of his more illustrious predecessor; but his efforts to recover this version were unsuccessful. Fresh attempts made by Hunt-

ington, British chaplain at Aleppo, on the suggestions of Fell, then Dean of Christ Church, also failed, although Huntington visited the convent in which the manuscripts were ultimately found. A generation later Renaudot insisted that an ancient Syriac version must exist or must have existed, because he had found several extracts from it in a collection of canons. Later yet, in 1725, J. S. Assemani spoke of a Syriac copy of the Acts of Ignatius in the Vatican Library, contained in a volume of martyrologies brought by himself from the Nitrian monastery of Scete. But although the rest of the volume was published, the Ignatian Acts were, for whatever reason, omitted. In this state the question remained until Mr. Cureton discovered a Syriac version in two MSS. which had been lately obtained for the British Museum. This version turned upon the Vossian text the whole battery of objections which had done execution on the Long recension. It contained only the epistles to Polycarp, the Ephesians, and the Romans, and even these appeared in a form shorter than that given in any Greek or Latin text. It was obviously possible that here and here only the genuine Ignatius had been given to the world of modern scholarship. This ground Mr. Cureton occupied without hesitation, affirming that the four remaining letters of the Vossian edition were all forgeries, as was also all the matter in the other three which was not found in the Syriac text. This challenge summoned critics on all sides to arms. Among the foremost was Dr. Wordsworth, afterwards Bishop of Lincoln, who, in characteristic phraseology, rejected the Curetonian version as 'a miserable epitome made by a Eutychian heretic;' but, strengthened in his convictions by the discovery of a third manuscript, Mr. Cureton published in 1849 his '*Corpus Ignatianum*,' to which he looked not without confidence for a final settlement of the question in accordance with his conclusions. For some time it seemed that his hope would be realised. For ages the Ignatian letters had been looked upon as vitiated by interpolations; and the credit of the Long recension had been exploded on this very ground. Here then was proof that the Vossian text was itself made up of similar accretions. The debate was not ended in Mr. Cureton's lifetime; nor was the extreme negative conclusion reached until, in 1870, Volkmar declared that the Vossian letters were only an expansion of the Syriac text, made about A.D. 170, and that the Curetonian epistles were them-

selves spurious. Volkmar afterwards admitted that his opinion had been shaken by the great work of Zahn on Ignatius. But the tide which had previously run high in Cureton's favour had already turned.

The history of the debate as given by Dr. Lightfoot is a narrative of singular interest; but we can note only one or two of the chief points which serve to show how irretrievably the arguments urged in favour of the Curetonian as the original version have been overthrown. Much was made of the supposed fact that all quotations from the Ignatian letters prior to Eusebius were derived from the Short recension. But although it is true that these quotations are all found in that form, they are all found also in the Middle recension, and therefore the inference is not decisive, and may be unwarrantable. Moreover, they are only three in number, and they are all obvious and striking; and if the Short form be the result of abbreviation, the retention of such striking passages is just what might be looked for. It can scarcely be said that these quotations furnish any presumption in favour of the Short form, but there are stronger considerations which tell directly against it.

The story of the career and death of Peregrinus is unquestionably, as we have seen, a satire on the circumstances preceding the martyrdom of Ignatius. Like Ignatius, Peregrinus is represented as sending about letters to nearly all the churches; but in the Short form there is nothing to which this sarcasm corresponds. More particularly, the words in which Lucian relates how Peregrinus 'nominated' (ἐχειροτόνησε) certain of his companions ambassadors (πρεσβευτάς), whom he called death-messengers (νεκραγγέλους) 'and infernal couriers (νερτεροδόρους),' have no parallel in the Syriac version; but, as Dr. Lightfoot conclusively remarks, the passage is adequately explained as a parody of the directions of Ignatius in the Vossian epistles to nominate (χειροτονεῖν) certain persons who should visit Syria as God-couriers (θεοδόμος) or God-ambassadors (θεοπρεσβευτήν).

The Short recension contains one letter only to Polycarp or his brethren; and this scarcely accounts for the number of which Polycarp himself speaks in his epistle to the Philippians.* The Middle form has a letter to the church of Smyrna, and another to their bishop; and Polycarp says that he is

* τὰς ἐπιστολὰς τὰς πεμφθείσας ἡμῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

sending to the Philippians at their request these letters together with others, 'as many as he had by him.*' The five additional letters of the Middle form would at once explain this expression; but it is impossible that he could have spoken thus of one letter only. Polycarp, again, speaks of Ignatius as directing him to take care that, if any one went to Syria, he should carry with him the letters from the Philippians also. These directions are found in the Middle recension; they are absent from the Curetonian or Short form. To bring the fight to closer quarters, Bishop Lightfoot points out a startling discrepancy between one of the two quotations of Origen as given in the Short form, and further gives the reasons which seem to prove conclusively that Origen had before him the Vossian letters. If, then, these quotations cannot be proved to be derived from the Short form, one quotation only remains, and 'an induction from a single example is no induction at all.'

Nor can anything more be made of the evidence of manuscripts. The references of Eusebius to the Vossian epistles have never been and cannot be questioned. 'But Eusebius,' Dr. Lightfoot remarks, 'wrote more than two centuries before the date of the earliest Syriac manuscript of the Curetonian epistles. Thus we are certified of the existence of the Vossian recension two hundred years before we hear of the Curetonian; and from that time forward the evidence for the former is varied and continuous, whereas the latter can produce no credentials outside these three Syriac manuscripts themselves.' But, further, there is no longer any question that the existing Armenian version, which contains the seven letters of the Vossian form, was made not from the Greek original, but from a Syriac translation. The close connexion of this Syriac version with the Curetonian letters has also been decisively established. Where they cover the same ground, they agree absolutely. Either, then, the Curetonian letters are abridged from this Syriac version, or the latter was an expansion from the former, made by filling in the missing parts by the aid of the Greek. The abridgement theory Bishop Lightfoot regards as a very simple postulate, which in truth it is. By dint of omitting and epitomising the transcriber might get through his task in a few hours.

'On the other hand, the expansion theory is,' he insists, 'full of

* καὶ ἄλλας ὅσας εἶχομεν παρ' ἡμῖν.

difficulties. We must suppose that some Syrian had before him the Curetonian letters in Syriac, and the Vossian letters in Greek; that he carefully noted all the passages which were wanting or transposed or different in the former; that he produced conformity by translating from the latter, supplying omissions, inverting transpositions, and altering divergencies; and that he did this in such a way as to produce a harmonious Syriac whole corresponding to the Greek whole which he had before him. If any one will take the trouble to compare the Vossian letters with the Curetonian, he will see what enormous labour and care such a work would involve. The relation is not one of simple curtailment or of simple expansion. It is one either of careless, rough, and capricious manipulation if the Curetonian letters be an abridgement of the Vossian, or of elaborate and consummate literary artifice if the Vossian letters be an expansion of the Curetonian. This being the relation between the two forms, it will be seen at once how great must have been the labour of the Syrian who set himself to fulfil the task here supposed. . . . It would perhaps be too much to say that no Syrian could have been found in those ages capable of such a work. But who would have been likely to undertake it? And what sufficient motive would he have had to stimulate and sustain him?' (Vol. i. p. 282.)

Addressing himself next to the internal evidence, Dr. Lightfoot submits to a searching comparison the diction of the three Syriac and the seven Vossian epistles. In upwards of a hundred instances he shows that the four epistles which do not appear in the Curetonian version exhibit precisely the same characteristics with the three which do appear in it. The words and phrases thus compared are most of them peculiar, many most unusual, while some are such as can scarcely be paralleled in any other writer. But, as Dr. Lightfoot very justly warns us, we have carefully to remember—

'that the whole body of the Curetonian letters when translated into English only occupies some six not very closely printed octavo pages; and that the seven epistles are only some four or five times as extensive. If this fact is borne in mind, the amount of coincidence is surprising; and one who maintains that the seven epistles of the Middle form were produced by interpolation from the Curetonian letters, postulates in his pseudo-Ignatius a prodigy of minute observation, of subtle insight, of imitative skill, of laborious care, which is probably without a parallel in the history of literary forgeries, and which assuredly was an utter impossibility among the Christians in the third and fourth centuries.' (Vol. i. p. 301.)

It is also of the highest importance to note that these coincidences of language extend to all the epistles; and thus Ussher is proved to be mistaken in rejecting the epistle to

Polycarp on the one side, while the position of Renan, who accepts only the single epistle addressed to the Romans, is shown to be untenable on the other. The results of an examination of the topics treated in the two recensions are not less decisive. Whatever may be the objections urged against the Middle and the Long recensions on the score of a supposed inherent unlikelihood or impossibility, may be brought with equal force against the letters of the Short form. The long journey to Rome, the vehement yearning for martyrdom, the self-depreciation which seems to border on extravagance, the free intercourse allowed to him with his friends, the power of writing or dictating letters to the absent, are all as much features of the Short as they are of the longer recensions. If, in spite of this overwhelming mass of adverse evidence or presumption, we still maintain the priority of the Curetonian letters, we must, in Dr. Lightfoot's judgement, make two great postulates; and from this conclusion it is hard to see any possibility of escape.

'We must first postulate a writer in the second or third century who makes a careful study of the three short Ignatian epistles before him; who has the patience and the insight to note all the most subtle features of vocabulary and grammar; who has the genius and the skill to reproduce all these characteristics; who, equipped with these capacities and acquirements, sets himself to interpolate, enlarge, and supplement these three letters so as to form a body of seven letters; who so performs this task that the sequence of thought is better observed in the enlarged epistles than in the original; who in the interpolated and forged portions so constructs his personal and historical framework as to reveal to a careful scrutiny subtle and inobtrusive harmonies and coincidences; and who exercises such self-restraint as to avoid all theological and ecclesiastical questions which have an interest for his own time, because they would be anachronisms. In short, he is prepared to sacrifice every conceivable purpose of a forgery to insure the success of his forgery. Who is bold enough to affirm that such a person could be found among the ranks of the Christians in these early ages?

'But, secondly, we are obliged to postulate in (say) the fourth or fifth century a Syriac translator, who, having before him a pre-existing Syriac version of the three short epistles, and also a Greek copy of the seven epistles (enlarged from the original three in the manner supposed), undertakes to bring the Syriac version into conformity with this enlarged body of letters. Accordingly, he not only translates the four additional epistles, removing, however, the two chapters which he finds ready to hand at the close of the Roman epistle in the existing Syriac version, and placing them in their new position in the Trallian epistle; but in the three epistles already rendered into Syriac he

supplies the insertions, effaces the omissions, transposes the transpositions, follows every arbitrary change, and thus produces a Syriac work exactly corresponding to the Greek. This task, indeed, does not suppose the same combination of qualities as the former, but it does demand marvellous patience. What parallel can be found to such a work in the Christian literature of those ages?

‘This last demand alone would be a severe strain, and an opinion so weighted would need very strong independent support to sustain it; but the two together are enough to break the back of any theory.’

We believe that few scholars and critics of whatever school who will patiently examine, link by link, the chain of arguments worked out with such thorough completeness by the Bishop of Durham, can fail to admit his conclusion ‘that the ‘Curetonian letters are an abridgement or mutilation of the ‘epistles of the Middle form.’ The interests which may have guided and the motives which may have prompted this epitomising or mutilating scribe in his task are points of slight importance. The motives of forgers are usually those which spring from considerations of convenience, and often do not travel beyond the notion of filling up a few blank pages in the parchment or paper on which the scribe has been writing. Examples of abridgement and mutilation abound in Greek, Roman, and Syriac literature; but they are often executed with far greater skill than that which marks the ‘loose and perfunctory curtailment’ of the Curetonian form, which, in Dr. Lightfoot’s words, ‘is neither epitome nor ‘extract, but something between the two.’

The Short and the Long recensions are therefore each finally set aside, the former as being nothing more or less than a selection of passages from longer writings which the scribe did not care to reproduce in full, the latter as overlying matter found ready to hand with a multitude of interpolations and a mass of forgeries and fictions. But the rejection of these two forms does not of itself establish the genuineness of any other. May we then safely maintain that the remaining seven letters of the Vossian form (six of these being accepted by Ussher) are the epistles which were written by the hand or taken down from the dictation of Ignatius? As in every other inquiry of the same sort, the conclusion must be determined by the internal and external evidence taken together. With most of this we have dealt already. We have seen that in the circumstances of his trial and condemnation, of his long journey and of the incidents which marked its course, there is nothing unlikely,

nothing in the least degree inconsistent with all that we know of the conditions of Roman government and society during the time in question. But if this be so, and if the text of these letters is assured to us, as Dr. Lightfoot rightly affirms, on testimony considerably greater than that of any ancient classical author, with one or two exceptions, the task of examination is really ended. Any other difficulties which may remain cannot be allowed to interfere with conclusions the rejection of which would render all historical criticism worthless.

The great stumblingblock which withheld French Protestant writers from admitting their genuineness was the definiteness with which in these letters the episcopal order was distinguished from that of presbyters. Whether the language of Ignatius really countenanced the sacerdotal theories of more modern theologians, was a question to be debated on its merits; but instead of making any attempt to determine this, they chose rather to decry the epistles as spurious. The letters pointed to an organisation which they supposed to be far in advance of the Ignatian age: the only course open to them, as they thought, was to reject the whole Ignatian literature. 'Apparently it did not occur to 'them,' Dr. Lightfoot quietly remarks, 'to ask whether 'Ussher's discovery did not require them to reconsider their 'fundamental position as regards episcopacy.' But if they are to be rejected, the epistle which bears the name of Polycarp must be rejected also; and to this question Dr. Lightfoot addresses himself with the same ability, patience, and success which marks his method of dealing with the Ignatian controversy. It is impossible for us to follow him at any length through the details of his investigation. It is enough to give his general conclusion, that the letter, being vouched for by his scholar Irenæus, has the highest authentication; that no anachronisms or incongruities have been proved against it, and that probably its genuineness would never have been seriously questioned, if it had not been for his references to the letters of Ignatius. If it be after all a forgery, it must be a forgery by the same hand which fabricated those letters; and this is a theory which cannot survive an examination of the two sets of letters. The mere literary contrast shows the wild extravagance of the hypothesis that, both being spurious, the letter of Polycarp was forged by the hand which fabricated the Vossian epistles, or that the former was forged at a later date by another hand

to bolster up the credit of the latter. To both these notions Dr. Lightfoot deals the deathblow. The former

'requires us to believe that a highly uncritical circle in a highly uncritical age (for great stress is laid on the uncritical character of the early Christian centuries and the early Christian society) produced a literary fiction which for subtlety of execution leaves the most skilful forgeries of the nineteenth century far behind. But suppose for a moment that such a consummate artist could have been found. What is the part assigned to him by this theory? What is supposed to have been his motive in the production of the letter bearing Polycarp's name? He is eager to establish the authority of the episcopate. Therefore he writes a letter which has proved a stronghold of presbyterianism. He desires to put down a particular type of heresy. So he disposes of the subject of heresy in two or three lines, of which the purport is far from obvious. He wishes to accredit certain previous forgeries of his own bearing the name of Ignatius. One of these was a letter from Ignatius to Polycarp. So in order to identify this letter, he makes Polycarp mention in the letter of Ignatius, to which he alludes, an injunction which is not found in the document which he wishes to recommend.'

The second hypothesis is rather one which may be formulated than urged with seriousness.

'It stands self-condemned. No instance has been produced in early Christian literature of a later forgery composed to support another by an earlier hand. The thing is hardly credible. Moreover both the earlier and the later forgery must have been composed between the ages of Ignatius and Irenæus. But what can have been the motive of the Polycarpian forger? What did he find in the previous Ignatian forgery which made him take so much pains to establish its credit? Was it the support of episcopacy? Why, he writes in such a way that he has himself been mistaken for a presbyterian.' (Vol. i. p. 583.)

It fares no better with those who resort to a theory of interpolation. No part of the letter of Polycarp is better authenticated than the concluding sentences which refer to the requests of Ignatius and the wishes of the Philippians. But if Polycarp's epistle is an adequate voucher for the genuineness of the Vossian letters, the case in their favour is immensely strengthened by the testimony of the satirist Lucian; and on this point also we have said enough already. The force of Lucian's testimony in proving the antiquity of the Ignatian epistles is admitted even by writers who call their genuineness into question. Renan receives only one letter. Baur would reject all. Both allow that Lucian's statements prove the existence of the series at the time when he wrote; and when he wrote, scarcely more

than a generation had passed away since the martyrdom of Ignatius.

Into the positive side of the question which turns on the theological polemics running through these epistles we do not enter. Dr. Lightfoot has not, we think, pressed the argument unduly. Ignatius was an uncompromising opponent of all opinions or beliefs which he regarded as erroneous or heretical, and the teaching which he denounces belongs beyond all doubt to the controversies of his own day. But the negative side of this subject is even more significant. Within some thirty years after his death the controversy as to the time of celebrating the Easter festival broke out and assumed the most threatening proportions. Ignatius, it cannot be doubted, would be a Quartodeciman, and the Quartodecimans were charged with the Judaism of which he himself was no sparing critic. If he was a Quartodeciman, must he not, on the hypothesis that the dispute had already broken out, have justified himself from this charge of Judaism? If he was not, would he not, or rather must he not, have come forward as an assailant of the opposite party? Yet his letters, Dr. Lightfoot declares, have not a word or a hint which can be turned to any use on either side. He may well ask, therefore, whether we are not bound to infer that the author of these letters lived and wrote before the outbreak of this fierce quarrel between the East and West. We are brought to the same conclusion when we turn to the Montanist disputes and to the theology or philosophy of Basilides, Marcion, and Valentinus. The first of these became notorious immediately after the Ignatian martyrdom. The second rose to eminence about the middle of the second century, while Valentinus was at least as old as Marcion if not older. Their theories were such as would have called forth the most vehement protests from such a man as Ignatius, yet to the systems of these teachers there is not only no distinct reference, but not even the faintest allusion.

Objections based on the style and character of the letters must be taken for what they may be worth. No one seemingly has urged that in the language of his epistles Ignatius is inconsistent with himself, that the peculiar words and phrases of one epistle are not to be found in the rest, or that the mental ability shown in any one is of a different stamp from that which is displayed in the others. But it has been argued by critics undoubtedly eminent that his imagery is extravagant, his language confused, his phraseology bom-

bastie, and that his letters are thus altogether unworthy of an Apostolic father. It may be so; and yet in no part of his work has the Bishop of Durham done better service in the cause of true judicial criticism than in those sections of his volume which deal with the personal work of Ignatius and with the estimate to be formed of his mental powers, his spiritual perceptions, and his theological beliefs. He might very naturally have approached the subject with the desire to bring out into the strongest possible relief all the sayings of Ignatius which might be twisted into complete agreement with the ecclesiastical theories of a later age. He has chosen the better and the wiser course of leaving Ignatius to speak for himself, and he has exhibited the martyr's convictions on such subjects as episcopacy and the sacraments with a clearness which ought to open the eyes of many who are apt to look at the Christendom of the second century through glasses, to say the least, very highly coloured.

If it could be shown that Ignatius makes statements of one kind in one letter and statements of a wholly different tenor in the rest, the argument might have some force. But objections urged against confused metaphors and stilted similes are almost puerile. It may be absurd in Ignatius to illustrate the Christian life by the working of a hauling engine, in which the Holy Spirit is compared to the rope and the faith of believers to the windlass. But, indeed, Dr. Lightfoot may well ask, 'on what grounds, prior to experience, have we any more right to expect either a faultless taste or a pure diction in a genuine writer at the beginning of the second century, than in a spurious writer at the end of the same?' Bad taste is not forgery, and sesquipedalian epithets are a blot on the pages of Greek writers for many a generation before the days of the Antiochene bishop. By some strange methods critics come to think that the style of a martyr should be pure and perspicuous. Vigorous with a rude strength of its own the style of Ignatius certainly is; but the words are piled or tumbled together in a very ungraceful manner. Yet why, Dr. Lightfoot again asks, should the style of an Apostolic father not be ungraceful? The objections urged on the score of Latinisms occurring in the epistles are unworthy of those who bring them. The Latinisms are but four in number. There are many more in the New Testament, in Epictetus, in the purest writers among the Greek fathers. Nor can much

be said in favour of objections resting on iteration of matter. There is a certain amount of repetition, more or less, in the letters to the Eastern churches; but the circumstances of these churches differed little. Even thus the repetitions in any two of the epistles are not nearly so many as those which may be traced through the letters of St. Paul to the Ephesians and Colossians. But Dr. Lightfoot notes it as a striking and significant fact that

‘When he addresses himself to a new audience he introduces a wholly new set of topics. The Ignatian letter to the Romans stands quite apart from the rest. This fact shows that the repetition arises not from poverty of thought in the author, but from similarity of circumstance in the person addressed. If the epistles had been a forgery and the reiterations had arisen from want of originality, they would have appeared not less in the epistle to the Romans than in the other letters. The same remark applies, though in a less degree, to the epistle to Polycarp. Indeed we may say generally that a forger, who has his time altogether at his disposal and works with a literary aim, is much more likely to avoid repetition than a person writing under the conditions under which Ignatius is assumed to have written.’

But Ignatius speaks of being chained to leopards; and it has been confidently maintained that this word was unknown before the age of Constantine. It is found, as Pearson showed, as early as in that of Severus. That any one should have seen signs of forgery in the *anacoluthic* or broken construction of the Ignatian sentences, seems strange indeed. Faulty grammar is, at the worst, a proof of haste or of carelessness or of ignorance. It is quite possible that Ignatius may have been chargeable with all three; but it is far more likely that the dislocation of grammar is the result of dictation, the letters being despatched without being even read over to the author. It seems impossible to explain in any other way the instance at the beginning of the letter to the Romans, in which the protasis is followed by seven successive sentences, each linked with the preceding by the conjunctive *γὰρ*, till with the broken grammar the original idea of the sentence disappears.

At length then we are free to maintain that in the Middle or Vossian form we have substantially the genuine work of Ignatius. Variations of text in greater or less measure there must be; but these, where a book is largely and widely quoted, are safeguards of genuineness, not signs of forgery. We may thus deal with these epistles as both genuine and authentic documents, and so turn to the most interesting

and the most valuable side of the arduous investigation, in every portion of which Bishop Lightfoot has expended the same conscientious care. The proof of the trustworthiness of these letters is, indeed, indispensably necessary; but not until it has been given is there any use in attempting to determine what the man was in himself, in his religious faith and convictions, and in the expression of them. That the importance of the inquiry is vast, we cannot fail to see. If we can ascertain the state of church organisation, discipline, and teaching in the time of Ignatius, we can measure the differences which separate his thoughts and beliefs from those of St. Paul, and we can determine not only the direction in which Christendom was drifting, but in great measure also the causes which impelled it to take one course rather than another.

If from the study of St. Paul's epistles we pass to the writings of Christian theologians of the fourth or fifth centuries, the main impression left upon the mind will probably be that there must have been at work almost from the first some strange influence which led men to confound mere signs and symbols with the realities of the spiritual world, or, to express it more briefly, displaced the spirit by the letter. Outward incidents have assumed an importance which St. Paul would have emphatically denied to them; and objects belonging to one order of things are held to act immediately on those of another. To trace the working of this influence from the Apostolic age becomes an imperative duty; and the genuine Ignatian literature must furnish, we might suppose, the most important field for this scrutiny. We cannot, indeed, fail to mark the vast gulf which separates much of the thought and language of Ignatius from the thought and language of St. Paul. The complacency with which the former dwells on the deceiving of the ruler of this world in the great drama of redemption is in truth amazing. 'Our God Jesus Christ,' he says, 'was conceived of Mary 'in the economy of God of the seed of David, and of the 'Holy Ghost; who was born and baptised that he might 'purify the passible waters; and there deceived the ruler 'of this world the virginity of Mary, and her childbirth, and 'in like manner also the death of the Lord; three mysteries 'of the Spirit, which were done in the silence of God.'* Whatever be the meaning of some of these phrases, we are

* Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. 18, 19.

tempted to say that here we have the very petrification of the spiritual life, a state of thought in which forms of words become everything, and the mind can lay hold of nothing except through sensuous signs. In this fact we have an explanation of the fascination which the subject of angelology has for Ignatius. It is true, as Dr. Lightfoot warns us, that the air was full of angelology at this time, and that both Jewish and Christian writers were putting forth their reveries with as much definiteness and precision as if they enunciated scientific facts. But the point is that Ignatius clearly makes no effort to rise above it. In fact, although he had a certain rough ability, his mind was not a powerful one; and this the Bishop of Durham frankly admits. His sincerity no one questions: about his wisdom opinions may be divided. Dean Milman regards his eager desire for martyrdom and his fear that the Roman Christians might interfere on his behalf as 'remarkably at variance with the sober dignity' of the Apostles.* Dr. Lightfoot is perhaps not altogether happy in pleading that the cause which he had at heart gained incomparably more by his death than it could have gained by his life, and that if his end was thus praiseworthy, it is scarcely fair to blame the means; but he is fully warranted in casting aside, as worthless, criticisms which imply that the conduct of an Apostolic father must always be absolutely blameless.

But if the stiffening of the faculties of spiritual perception betrayed by the language of Ignatius was a source of dire mischief for the religious thought of the second century, the obstinacy with which his friend Polycarp clung to words as to immovable props was a still greater disaster. Eminently fitted, as Dr. Lightfoot pronounces him, to serve as a depository of tradition at a time when wild speculations were being multiplied on all sides, he became as rigid in his phraseology as his opponents were loose or inexact.

'An original mind,' says Dr. Lightfoot, 'will unconsciously infuse into the deposit committed to it its own ideas and designs. But Polycarp's mind was essentially unoriginate. It had, as far as we can discover, no creative power. . . . He never rises above mere commonplace. A steadfast, stubborn adherence to the lessons of his youth and early manhood—an unrelaxing, unwavering hold of the word that was delivered to him from the beginning—this, so far as we can read the man from his own utterances or from the notices of others, was the characteristic of Polycarp.' (Vol. i. p. 459.)

* History of Christianity, book iv. c. i.

The criticism is just and fair, but it is an admission of his dullness, and we should have felt more indebted to Bishop Lightfoot if he had admitted further that, whether from this dullness or from whatever cause, Polycarp was tempted himself, and could scarcely fail to lead others, to put the letter which kills in place of the lifegiving spirit. Far, however, from calling into question the Bishop's judgement generally, we regret that it is not in our power to go through his chapters on Polycarp as we have gone through those which deal with the Ignatian literature. The estimate which he gives of both these martyrs will commend itself to all readers. It is enough to say here that in spite of the stiffening process which was going on in the thought of the age, the true spiritual tradition still survived. The only definition of the blood of Christ which has come down to us from primitive times, has come to us, as Dean Stanley* remarks, from Ignatius. The blood of Christ, Ignatius tells the Trallians, is love or charity. If this were all that we had received from him, this alone would have entitled him to the lasting gratitude of Christendom.

But it is notorious that one main reason which has impelled critics of certain schools to question the genuineness of the Ignatian epistles, has been the fear that the admission of it would justify the position even of the Tridentine theologians. The epistles, however, are genuine; and we have only to see whether this fear is justified, and whether the language of Ignatius really lends itself to the high sacerdotal and sacramentarian theories which it has been supposed to favour. The impression had its origin in the interpolated and spurious matter of the Long recension; but there is no doubt that on the subject of the priesthood and the episcopate the martyr's words are strong. The bishop ought to be regarded as the Lord Himself; he who honours the bishop is honoured of God; he who acts without his knowledge serves the devil. Such citations may be multiplied; but in these utterances generally Dean Milman long ago traced a purpose, not of raising the sacerdotal power, but of enforcing Christian unity; and Dr. Lightfoot has proved decisively that no other conclusion is admissible. If submission is required to the bishop, it is required also to the presbyters, and beyond these to the deacons, beyond these again to the whole body of the faithful. 'Be ye subject to the bishop and to each other, as Jesus Christ to the Father, and the Apostles to

* Christian Institutions, 117.

‘Christ, to the Father, and to the Spirit.’ On this point the Bishop of Durham says trenchantly that the conception of the episcopal office itself is wholly different from the ideas which prevailed in the latter years of the second century, and that throughout these letters there is not the slightest tinge of sacerdotal language in reference to the Christian ministry. He denies, further, that there is any approach even to the language of Irenæus, ‘who, regarding the episcopate as the depositary of the doctrinal tradition of the Apostles, lays stress on the Apostolical succession as a security for its faithful transmission.’ The subject is so important that we do not hesitate to cite the bishop’s statement of the case.

‘In these Ignatian epistles the episcopate, or rather the threefold ministry, is the centre of order, the guarantee for unity, in the Church. . . . Heresies are rife; schisms are imminent. To avert these dangers, loyalty to Church rulers is necessary. There is no indication that he is upholding the episcopal against any other form of Church government, as, for instance, the presbyteral. The alternative which he contemplates is lawless isolation and self-will. . . . If obedience is due to the bishop as to the grace of God, it is due to the presbytery as to the law of Jesus Christ. If the bishop occupies the place of God or of Jesus Christ, the presbyters are as the Apostles, as the council of God. This last comparison alone would show how widely the idea of the episcopate differed from the later conception, when it had been formulated in the doctrine of the Apostolical succession.’ (Vol. i. p. 382.)

The inferences from these statements are obvious. But the light which the Ignatian letters throw on the unequal developement of the episcopate in different parts of Christendom is also very instructive. The other letters are full of exhortations on this subject. The letter to the Romans speaks of himself once as the bishop of or from Syria, and makes no further reference to his order. It ascribes a high importance to the Roman Church, and indeed the writer dreads lest the influence of the Roman Christians should deprive him of his hope of achieving discipleship; but not a word is said about the Roman bishop.

‘Indeed there is not,’ Dr. Lightfoot remarks, ‘even the faintest hint that a bishop of Rome existed at this time. To ourselves the Church of Rome has been so entirely merged in the bishop of Rome that this silence is the more surprising. Yet, startling as this omission is, it entirely accords with the information derived from other trustworthy sources. All the ancient notices point to the mature developement of episcopacy in Asia Minor at this time. On the other hand, all the

earliest notices of the Church in Rome point in the opposite direction. In the epistle of Clement, which was written a few years before these Ignatian letters purport to be penned, there is no mention of the bishop. The letter is written in the name of the Church; it speaks with the authority of the Church. It is strenuous, even peremptory, in the authoritative tone which it assumes, but it pleads the authority not of the chief minister but of the whole body.' (Vol. i. p. 384.)

Not less instructive is the circumstance, clearly attested by the letter of Polycarp, that in Smyrna the ecclesiastical organisation had not reached the stage of developement which it had attained at Antioch.

'In Polycarp's epistle there is, from first to last, no mention of the episcopate. There is every reason for believing that Polycarp was bishop of Smyrna at this time; yet in the heading of the letter . . . he does not insert his title, but contents himself with writing "Polycarp and the presbyters with him." Again, in the body of the letter he speaks at length about the duties of the presbyters, of the deacons, of the widows, and others; but the bishop is entirely ignored.' (Vol. i. p. 578.)

The same inequality of developement is brought out in other matters by a comparison of the language of Ignatius with that of Polycarp.

'The former,' Dr. Lightfoot remarks, 'dwells frequently and with great emphasis on the blood of Christ, the passion of Christ, the cross of Christ, as an object of belief, as a centre of unity, and a source of life; whereas in Polycarp the blood of Christ is only once mentioned, where it is regarded as a crime demanding vengeance, and the cross of Christ only twice, where it is a protest against doctrinal or practical opponents. Again, there is in Polycarp an entire absence of that sacramental language which confronts us again and again in the most startling forms in Ignatius. Moreover, he has not a single word to say about the unity of the Church, which occupies so large a space on the canvas of Ignatius. Indeed, the Church is not once named by him, and the only occurrence of the word *ἐκκλησία* itself is in the opening of the letter, where it is applied to a particular community.' (Vol. i. p. 580.)

The Eucharistic phraseology of Ignatius is, no doubt, striking; but the key to it is found in the passage already cited, where the blood of Christ is declared to be his love, while his flesh is represented by faith. The contrast between the two writers is indeed strongly marked; and it has its importance, not merely as illustrating the history of Christian thought, but as establishing the genuineness of both sets of letters.

Regarded dispassionately, both sets of documents are full

of instruction for the sober-minded student of early Christian history. They bring before us a time of transition between the more spiritual faith of the Apostolic age and the comparatively rigid dogmatic system which had established itself in the days of Irenæus. Here and there a term is found with which we grow familiar in later records, but found with a very different connotation. The word *catholic* in the Ignatian letters has no reference to orthodoxy as opposed to heresy. It means simply that which is general or universal, as in the phrases 'catholic history' or 'catholic resurrection.' The connotation of error as distinguished from truth, of conformity as contrasted with dissent, marks the later use of the word. In the pages of Ignatius the former sense alone is found. In the letter to the Smyrnæans

'Jesus Christ is said to stand to the universal church in the same relation as the bishop to the particular church. Similarly, elsewhere ("Magn." 3), the Father is styled "the Bishop over all," as contrasted with Damas, the bishop over the Magnesians. Here then the "catholic" or "universal Church" is opposed to the Smyrnæan Church, the particular community over which Polycarp presides. . . . In the passage from the "Martyrdom of Polycarp" . . . the Church in Smyrna over which he presides is itself styled the Catholic Church. It is so called in distinction to the heretical or separated bodies which had sprung up meanwhile.' (Vol. i. p. 400.)

It follows first that 'when Catholic was applied alike to 'the universal Church and the particular Church, it would no longer be used safely to designate the universal Church as 'contrasted with the particular Church,'* and next that the Ignatian letters belong to an age earlier than that which produced the 'Martyrdom of Polycarp.'

Dr. Lightfoot's second volume, like the first, is concerned with a multitude of topics, many of the deepest interest, and all treated with the same clearness, fulness, and force. Into these we cannot enter; nor for our purpose is it necessary to do so. It has been our wish to exhibit in all its bearings the main questions which Dr. Lightfoot has sought to answer; and we have no hesitation in saying that he has answered these questions with triumphant success. The genuineness of the Vossian letters has been finally established; the wisdom of Ussher has been fully vindicated; and the Ignatian controversy has been set at rest, with little chance or none of being again reopened. Dr. Lightfoot's mode of dealing with the evidence which his unwearied toil has brought together, will

* Vol. i. p. 400.

commend itself even to those who may take up the book with prepossessions in favour of the Tübingen school of critics; and his main conclusions will, beyond doubt, be accepted by all impartial and independent students and thinkers. Those who can appreciate, further, the critical skill, the vast labour, the wide range and variety of learning, and the conscientious care needed for the achievement of this great task, will feel grateful for efforts which, in spite of all hindrances and distractions, have been crowned with decisive success. These volumes throw fresh light on the religious life and history of the second century of the Christian era. They show us how the earliest faith in a Divine kingdom of truth and righteousness, mercy and love, working against and fighting with the kingdom of evil, was brought into contact with influences which tended to weaken, distort, and corrupt it; and showing this, they help us to understand better the later changes which overlaid the good news of Christ with a network of iron formulas put forth as living principles.

ART. V.—1. *Needlework as Art.* By Lady MARIAN ALFORD. London: 1886.

2. *Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten, oder praktische Aesthetik.* Von Professor Dr. GOTTFRIED SEMPER. Zweite Auflage. München: 1878.

3. *La Tapisserie dans l'Antiquité.* Par LOUIS DE RONCHAUD. Paris: 1884.

4. *A Short History of Tapestry from the earliest Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century.* By EUGÈNE MÜNTZ. Translated by Miss LOUISA J. DAVIS. London: 1885.

IT has become the fashion to take things seriously. 'Movements' in all manner of directions, and for all sorts of purposes, are the order of the day. Their resultant effect forms a curious problem in social dynamics, of which we, at least, shall not adventure a solution. Meanwhile, we may thankfully accept whatever good ensues from attempts at reform prompted by amiable if exaggerated fervours. Enthusiasm is bound to be one-sided; else it would lack motive power. Limited faculties are apt to become paralysed by too wide a survey of possibilities.

Our present concern is with a species of border zone, or district of divided ownership, between two wide provinces of modern organised endeavour. Efforts towards improving

the position of women cannot be better expended than in giving higher significance to work specially appropriated to them. Efforts towards raising the standard of art can scarcely exclude that primitive mode of decoration in which the needle replaces the pencil, and variously tinted threads are substituted for pigments. To some, whose conception of the attainable with such materials was fixed by the cross-stitch and tent-stitch abominations of our grandmothers, and who have ignored the earnest and not unsuccessful studies of the last score of years, it may, indeed, even still be a new idea that needlework is, or may be, a branch of art. But we venture to assert that these doubts will cease after a perusal, however cursory, of the beautiful volume which has suggested our present theme.

It is one which Lady Marian Alford has made peculiarly her own by prolonged and painstaking research. She was one of the promoters of the Loan Exhibition of Embroidery at the South Kensington Museum in 1873; she is one of the patronesses of the Royal School of Art Needlework. The bulky tome before us developed out of a projected sequel to the 'Handbook' edited by her in 1880 for the latter institution. Its scope is a wide one. The history and archaeology of a branch of art already highly cultivated in the time of Moses, are embraced by it; it includes the consideration of changes of style attendant upon countless vicissitudes of empire, religion, and culture; while the inculcation of sound principles of taste is an object wisely yet unobtrusively pursued throughout its pages. Neither pains nor expense has been spared in order to secure the adequate execution of a difficult task; and the result is a contribution of no slight value to the literature of decorative art. The illustrations are numerous and excellent; the letterpress is full of varied interest. Information, diligently gathered from multitudinous sources, is conveyed in a straightforward and unpretending style; the best authorities have everywhere been consulted, and the best examples personally inspected; while obligations (sometimes considerable) are acknowledged with an honesty not amongst the least pleasing features of this very creditable performance.* Each of its chapters might

* We have noticed a few oversights and misprints, which we hope to see corrected in a future edition. Herr Theodor Graf's name, for instance, through unfamiliarity, doubtless, with the adjectival form given to proper names in German, is everywhere written *Graf'schen*; and at page 130 some confusion seems to have crept in between Cyrene

separately furnish the subject of a critical dissertation ; we can, however, permit ourselves to touch only on a few salient points in the history of art needlework, referring our readers to the book itself for ampler details.

The universal decorative instinct of humanity can hardly have found an earlier form of gratification than in some fashion of embroidery. From the day that the 'cave man' first threaded his wide-eyed bone needle with the sinew of a reindeer to stitch together his garments of bison or antelope skin, the invention of the art was inevitable. A seam, it has been remarked, is a suggestion. Its very ugliness prompts embellishment. Witness the familiar 'herring-boning' process, by which modern seamstresses render the junction of two edges of flannel at once more secure and less unsightly. It was on this principle of making 'a virtue of necessity' * that the capes of reindeer skin worn by the ancient Germans † depended for what beauty they possessed. Originally designed, no doubt, to serve the same purpose with the waterproof 'overalls' which Hesiod recommended his model farmer to cobble up out of kid skins against the approach of bad weather, ‡ they grew to be highly decorative. And this through the frank recognition of structural necessities. Each seam of the skins exposed defiantly to view furnished the 'motive' for a system of ornamentation with strips of leather, variously tinted and elaborately stitched, the general effect resembling that of Canadian moccasins or Russian fur boots. So fashionable did these 'renones' become amongst Roman fops in the decline of the Empire, that a sumptuary edict was issued under Honorius against the use of barbarian apparel as premonitory of barbarian conquest. So indeed it proved ; yet less so than the ineffectual fears which the edict itself betrayed, but neither relieved nor reassured.

Descended most likely from these trans-Rhenine 'imper-meables,' the fur-lined mantles displayed at the court of Charlemagne had lost in *naïveté* what they had gained in splendour. The 'seamy side,' no longer presented and made the best of, was veiled in rich stuffs, to which borders and

the Greek colony and the nymph Cyrene mother of Aristæus the bee-keeper. The index stands in need of complete revision ; the headings are too few, they are ill chosen, nor are they always even alphabetically arranged.

* Semper, 'Der Stil,' Band I., p. 73.

† Tacitus, 'Germania,' cap. xvii.

‡ Erga, 543.

embroideries in birds' plumage were added. This method of adornment was perhaps imported from the East. Where birds are so soberly dressed as in our cold northerly climates, it was little likely to originate, and could scarcely continue to prevail. In other parts of the world, however, it has been carried to singular perfection. Marvellous specimens of the skill attained in the art of painting with feathers amongst the Aztecs and Peruvians, were brought home by the Spaniards after the conquest. No longer merely decorative, it aspired to imitation. Its success is still attested by a triptych in the Cluny Museum, and by the mitre of San Carlo Borromeo at Milan. The pictorial masterpieces of Europe were copied with the utmost fidelity in the plummy spoils of humming birds and parroquets. Only the convincing evidence of touch, it is said, could silence the incredulity of Pope Sixtus V. as to the materials used in a portrait of St. Francis executed in Mexican feather work.*

In China, there is good reason to believe, the decorative use of plumage was extensively diffused at least 4,000 years ago. And here it had a special significance in the history of our subject, for from its imitation in threads or fibres one of the two great branches of embroidery with the needle took its rise.

To make sure of our ground let us define our terms. 'Embroidery' is the decoration in some kind of pattern of an already existent material. It has no organic connexion with the stuff serving as its foundation. It might even be called a gratuitous addition to it. In tapestry and the finer kinds of lace, on the contrary, the design is an integral part of the fabric. Both come simultaneously into being under the hand of the worker.

Now embroidery, as thus defined, separated from the first into two predominant varieties; that is to say, it was and is practised in two principal kinds of stitch, each giving rise to a characteristic style of pattern.

The ancient '*opus plumarium*'—a designation which, Anglicised as 'plumage work,' Lady Marian Alford proposes to substitute for the less descriptive names of 'long stitch,' 'flat stitch,' or 'satin stitch'—flourishes at the present day in many elaborate forms of embroidery. There seems little doubt that it originated in the attempt to copy the primitive Chinese feather work. It is still the favourite

* Ferdinand Denis, '*Arte Plumaria*,' p. 23.

pastime of Chinese ladies, and the perfection with which it can be made to counterfeit the plumage of living birds is well shown in a photograph of two specimens of modern Japanese '*opus plumarium*' reproduced by our authoress. Derived again thence—an imitation of an imitation—is the sheeny silken stuff known to us as '*satin*' (from the name, modified by Arabic pronunciation, of the Chinese town Tsen-thung), which, creeping slowly westward, began to be heard of in England early in the fourteenth century. Thus, the glossy robes Sir Peter Lely loved to paint may be said to have been, as to material, in the third generation of descent from the feather trimmings on the mantle of Charlemagne.

Chinese, Babylonian, Phœnician embroideries were for the most part executed in '*plumage stitch*.' Distinctively Egyptian, on the other hand, was the '*opus pulvinarium*,' so called from the cushions or hassocks the adornment of which constituted its chief mediæval application. This style has amongst ourselves only of late shaken off the bondage of bad taste imposed by a total misconception of the laws of style. As '*Berlin wool work*' it had come to be a byword and a scoffing. The study of ancient patterns, and above all the reverting to the great artistic principle of *obedience*—of cheerful acquiescence, that is, in the necessity of working *within* prescribed limits, instead of restlessly striving to overpass them—has restored to it much of its early credit.

Its essential characteristic is strict subordination to the texture it adorns. Each stitch is *counted*—it covers so many threads of warp and woof, not one more, not one less. Caprice is rigidly excluded. The rule of number is absolute. Its slightest infraction is at once seen to be fatal to the whole plan of ornamentation. This should accordingly include only geometrical or highly conventional designs. Naturalistic efforts lead, not to developement, but to degradation. '*Cushion work*,' in short, bears to '*plumage work*' very much the same relation that mosaic does to painting; hence the appropriateness of the term '*mosaic stitch*' applied to it by Dr. Semper. It is obviously posterior in date to the other branch of embroidery, implying, as it does, the previous invention of the art of weaving; while the feathery kind may be, and is, applied to skins or bark as well as to canvas or linen.

Some admirable specimens of Egyptian cross stitching are

preserved in the British and Turin Museums. One such figured by Semper was taken from a tomb at Saccarah, and must be of vast antiquity; quite possibly the fingers that wrought it were mummied 6,000 years ago! It is a linen tunic laid out, as it were, in a stiff parterre of stitching. The design is in unimpeachable taste, simply because the subjection of purpose to possibility is unqualified.

To a widely different category of art needlework belongs the surprising relic described by Mr. Villiers Stuart in 1882. The 'funeral tent of an Egyptian queen' formed part of the sepulchral trappings just then discovered in the royal tombs at Deir-al-Bahari, near the ancient Thebes. The lady whose remains it had covered was a contemporary of the Queen of Sheba. Her grandfather may have bowed before the charms of Helen when the guest of Polydamna, 'wife of Thon.' Her son-in-law, Shisak, first king of the Bubastite dynasty, captured Jerusalem shortly after the death of Solomon. Queen Isi-em-Kheb, however, did not live so long. She died young, and her obsequies must have been celebrated within a few years of 1000 B.C. The date of the 'tent' is thus perfectly well ascertained.

It is the earliest example extant of 'opus consutum,' or patchwork. Constructed of innumerable fragments of gazelle hide, finely stitched together, its surface even now retains the gloss of a kid glove, and displays in marvellous freshness, considering the antiquity of their application, the four colours—red or bright pink, yellow (two shades), bluish green, and pale blue—employed to produce a striking, if somewhat gaudy, decorative effect; an effect, to our ideas, strangely incongruous with its sombre destination. The shape, size, and design of this ample expanse of variegated leather (201 square feet in area) correspond unmistakeably to its purpose as a canopy for the royal coffin. A central panel, nine feet by six, was adorned, over one half of its surface, with pink and yellow rosettes on a blue ground; over the other, with six flying vultures, emblematic of supernal protection, separated by bands of hieroglyphics, setting forth the earthly dignities and immortal hopes of the illustrious departed. Four attached flaps, chequered pink and green, completed the covering of the mortuary shrine. The borders display, amongst other emblems, gazelles kneeling in adoration on either side of a sacred tree or shrub. The device (with unessential modifications) was prehistorically diffused in the East, and is thought to have been connected with the old Aryan homa worship. It survives, with little or none of

its primitive significance, on some modern Indian fabrics and in Russian peasant embroideries.

A fragment of drift wood from the wreck of dynasties, the pall of Isi-em-Kheb is now safely stored in the Boulak Museum. Modern archæologists have had many strokes of luck, but none more farfetched, more fantastic, than the emergence to the light, in good condition, of an embroidered canopy nearly three thousand years old. Nothing, after this, seems too much to expect from the capricious clemency of time. We need not despair of seeing the web of Penelope unearthed from some subterranean hiding place in Ithaca, or the peplum of Alcisthenes dug up out of the ruins of Carthage.

The textile honours of the dead continued until far on in the Middle Ages. A profusion of draperies, wrought in gold with hunting scenes, Centaurs and Lapithæ, griffins and chimæras, formed part of the insane extravagance of the pyre of Hephæstion. Ammianus Marcellinus speaks of persons 'shining in silken raiment as if decked out for burial.'* St. Jerome alludes to shrouds woven of gold, precisely such as enveloped the relics of St. Cecilia when discovered by Pope Paschal in 821; and thirty-six pounds of the precious metal were extracted in 1544 from the tomb of the Empress Maria, daughter of Stilicho. Wholly sepulchral in its destination was Herr Theodor Graf's treasure-trove from the Fayoum, of woven and embroidered garments and Persian tapestries, dating from the third to the ninth centuries A.D.; and some of the most interesting specimens of mediæval textile art have been found in tombs. Witness the silken pall of Bishop Gunther of Bamberg (died 1064), symbolically figured with the coronation of a Byzantine emperor, whose purple robe is diversified with the clubs and spades of our playing cards; and the splendid tissue taken from the shrine erected to receive the bones of Charlemagne by Frederick Barbarossa in 1166. An inscription in Greek letters shows this gay winding sheet to have come from the imperial treasury at Constantinople; but the design is Indian, including as its most conspicuous feature yellow elephants with blue trunks promenading over a scarlet field. Very similar must have been the vestments 'storied with elephants' described by Anastasius the librarian, in his *Life of Leo III.*†

* Cahier et Martin, 'Mélanges d'Archéologie,' tom. ii. p. 244.

† Ibid., tom. ii. pp. 103, 238, plate ix.

Considerable skill in decorative needlework is shown by the Book of Exodus to have been acquired by the Israelites in Egypt. The hangings for the tabernacle, as well as the girdle of Aaron, wrought by them in the desert, were perhaps first woven in particoloured stripes, and afterwards adorned by hand.* The powers of the loom do not at that early time appear to have reached beyond the production of the simplest patterns. Designs of the slightest complexity were necessarily executed with the needle. Thus the mystical cherubim depicted on the veil of the tabernacle, were undoubtedly embroideries in the proper sense of the term; while the pomegranates adorning the edge of Aaron's tunic are thought to have been of cut work, such as we have just seen exemplified in the pall of Isi-em-Kheb.

The art, however, thus displayed seems to have died out. Holy Writ affords at least no further instances of its *native* exercise. The veil of Solomon's Temple was of Tyrian workmanship: in the rebuilding after the Captivity its place was taken, it is practically certain, by a fabric from Babylon. Regarding the ultimate fate of the latter, M. Clermont-Ganneau has collected some curious and convincing evidence of identity between the curtain dedicated by Antiochus Epiphanes in the temple of Zeus at Olympia, and that taken from the Jewish sanctuary when he captured Jerusalem in 170 B.C.†

The veil rent asunder to signify the abrogation of the Old Law, was the offering of Herod. Worked at Babylon, it belonged to that peculiar class of art productions memorably illustrated in the Homeric shield of Achilles, and which may be described as *cosmical*. Its very materials were symbolical, and stood for the elements of the world: fine flax for the earth, purple for the sea, for the blaze of fire scarlet, blue for the firmamental azure.‡ The whole scheme of the heavenly bodies, moreover, all but the twelve signs, which from their connexion with idolatry were an abomination in Jewish eyes, was set forth in its embroideries.

On a no less comprehensive if an abortive plan was the mantle of Demetrius Poliorcetes, King of Macedonia. For while cunning Cypriot needles were still employed in portraying upon it the whole visible framework of nature, the

* Rock, 'Textile Fabrics,' Introduction, p. lxxxvi.

† Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement, 1878, p. 79.

‡ Josephus, 'De Bello Jud.' lib. v. cap. 5.

fortunes of the intended wearer suffered collapse, and it remained, as if by a stroke of irony, unfinished. The universe has since then notably widened. The great cosmical serpent of antique symbolism no longer, as of old, comfortably grasps his tail with his teeth. A moral in art is pointed by the mantle of Demetrius. It was an attempt to realise the unattainable, and such attempts are successful only in fairy tales. There they somehow seem to render pleasantly nebulous our ideas of what is possible. In actual life they define them by failure. We can readily fancy the soft radiance emanating from the shining embroideries of sun, moon, and Pleiades, on the three robes of the Hungarian folk tale, for each of which a nut served as a commodious wardrobe; and a beneficent White Cat meets no disbelief for its gift of a tissue, 400 ells long, yet capable of being folded within a millet seed, and drawn through the eye of a fine needle, exhibiting, besides the complete fauna and flora of land and sea, a cosmopolitan royal portrait gallery including each reigning monarch of the globe with his wife, family, and dependants. Yet even the minor ambition, actually realised in a cashmere shawl belonging to the Prince of Wales, of constructing a textile map of a single city (Srinagar, the capital of Cashmere), is felt, in the dry light illuminating a glass case in a museum, to have overreached itself. Nothing is, however, wanting to the minute exactitude of the representation.* There are the narrow streets and canals overhung by balconied houses, the market place and thronging foot passengers, the mosques and temples, the ultramarine river with its seven bridges and boats lying quiet under the sapphire sky of the East. The total effect, nevertheless, is only to emphasise a mistake. Geographical aspirations in needlework are of the past. They were at one time taken very seriously. An embroidered 'orbis terrarum' was, a thousand years ago, a treasure for a king. It would now be an object of derision in a schoolroom. Astrology, too, has had its day; the imperial mantle at Bamberg, inscribed with a planisphere and stellar prognostics,† is an almost isolated survival. Its Arab character is explained by its origin. It was the gift of Ishmael of Bari to the Emperor Henry II., and can only have been the work

* Birdwood, 'Industrial Arts of India,' vol. ii. p. 115.

† Described in Bock's 'Kleinodien des heiligen römischen Reiches,' p. 191; figured in pl. xli.

(since silk weaving was unknown in Italy in the eleventh century) of the Saracens of Sicily.

Celestial reminiscences in textiles are now left to the Indian fabric known as *chand-tara*, or 'moon and stars,' because diapered with those luminaries. Nothing is too great, nothing too little, to be appropriated by man's eager decorative instinct. The suns of space must needs do duty as a pattern on a Hindu woman's skirt, the material for which was extracted from the entrails of a worm!

The relatively high position among the arts anciently occupied by textiles is admitted, and can easily be explained. Tapestry and hangings were, in early times, an integral part of architecture. Erections for man's living use were incomplete without them. They were, it has been said, the necessary raiment of buildings. Not yet reduced to the status of mere furniture, they discharged the indispensable duties of doors, partitions, and ceilings. Their profuse employment marked the transition from the tent to the house, and was encouraged by the serenity of the skies that smiled on dawning civilisations.

Now the dignity of any branch of imaginative industry is commonly proportioned to its importance. Art cannot fitly be cultivated on esoteric principles. It pines in the hothouse of æstheticism. It thrives amid the swing and bustle of joyous human life. Even needlework craves this larger impulse. So long as it is confined to the ornamentation of a screen or a settee, its capabilities must remain cramped, and its purposes unaspiring. Every circumstance in its long history attests this law of developement and degeneracy with the rise and fall of nobleness in its uses.

The historical restoration to draperies of their primitive architectural importance is mainly due to the researches of Dr. Semper, of whose valuable work we have quoted the title at the head of this article. The discovery, it has been well observed by M. de Ronchaud, is complementary to those of the polychrome decoration of Greek buildings, and of the tinting of Greek statues.

The result has been to modify profoundly our ideas of Greek life in its external aspect. This was very far from what we are accustomed to think of as 'classical.' The cold dignity of unmitigated Parian was by no means to an Athenian's taste. He would have shivered before the white ghosts of his glowing temples and rosy goddesses, which have made us in love with the past. He was in truth far more of an Oriental than we have been accustomed to admit.

He felt all the rapture of Eastern magnificence. His eye craved for light and lustre: it distinguished and demanded beauty of form; but it demanded it vivified with the rainbow hues of life. A Greek temple did not display merely the exquisite symmetry of a flower, it had also something of its festive brilliancy. Not a square inch of its surface was left in the native crudity of the quarry. An harmonious chord of colour vibrated from the bases of the columns to the crowning figure of the pediment they supported; draperies, 'twice dyed' in purple and scarlet, veiled the cella reserved for exclusive Olympian habitation; the midday glare fell modified, as if by painted glass, across rich canopies; the work of the chisel on the frieze was continued by the needle on tapestries hung from pillar to pillar of an arcade, and disguising or replacing an unsightly partition. Thus Pheidias had at his command for the building of the Parthenon not only masons and sculptors, painters and engravers, workers in gold and ivory, but also weavers and stitchers (probably for the most part of barbarian origin); nor is it improbable that the supreme genius which conceived the Birth of Athene employed itself as well in designing the subjects of their embroideries.

M. de Ronchaud has written an interesting essay (which we have included amongst our authorities) to prove that these identical Pheidian draperies were those described by Euripides as forming the 'tent of Ion.' A wide canopy, fabled to have been offered by Hercules from Amazonian spoils, figured the celestial phenomena it concealed. The sun and dawn, the moon and stars, Orion, the Pleiades, the whirling Bear, were visible on its expanse. On lateral hangings Centaurs and Lapiths renewed the immortal brutality of their combat, lions and stags were hunted or turned to bay; the battle of Salamis progressed to a less arduous victory, forming a subject comparable for infelicitous patriotism to the defeat of the Spanish Armada, represented in all the detail of towering galleons, veering frigates, forts on a small, and dolphins on a large scale, on a set of *point d'Angleterre* offered to Queen Charlotte in the last century.* Finally, the legend of Cecrops was wrought on the entrance curtain, a saffron-tinted background relieving the long procession of pictured scenes.

Of saffron, too, was the famous peplum of Athene, embroidered with the 'Gigantomachia' by the maiden fingers

* Ch. Blanc, 'Art in Ornament and Dress,' p. 207.

of the Arrhephoræ, and borne in procession at the Pan-athenaic celebration once in four years. Pheidias has immortalised in the Parthenon marbles the pomp observed in bearing it to its destination in the temple of Poseidon Erechtheus. For not the brand-new, stately chryselephantine goddess, but an unpretending olive-wood idol, ejected to make room for her, was the recipient of this solemn gift. It appears to have been an article, not of apparel, but of furniture. 'Peplos' is used indifferently for a woman's upper garment, a curtain, or a canopy. The saffron here appropriated to the surroundings of Athene denoted, doubtless, early auroral associations. The Homeric Dawn receives no more frequent epithet than 'saffron-robed.'

The relations of needlework to sculpture and painting, as well as to architecture, have been fruitfully investigated by Dr. Semper. His conclusion is this. That imitative or decorative representation with the needle led the way for, and was at first submissively followed by, the other arts—that the earliest bas-reliefs were properly embroideries in stone, the earliest wall paintings stitcheries in pigments, the earliest mosaics translations from textiles to terracotta. Facts, already numerous, and visibly tending to multiply, can be alleged in support of inferences which they almost require us to accept, while permitting us to modify.

The ornamentation of clothing seems first to have been carried to a high pitch in those silent cities by the Tigris, once as strong in pride of power and luxury as any modern metropolis. The details of that ornamentation have been so minutely copied with the chisel on the alabaster slabs veneering the ancient masonry at Nimroud and Khorsabad as to bring them distinctly before our eyes. Asurbanipal hunting lions wears a close-fitting vest patterned all over with lotus and asters (see 'Needlework as Art,' plate i. p. 22). Its short sleeves are clasped with gold upon his brawny arms, and massive gold bracelets adorn his wrists. His royal mantle has been flung aside in the excitement of the sport, but we are familiar, from other examples, with its aspect. A central compartment displayed perhaps the king offering sacrifice, or a tree of life worshipped by a pair of genii; round which several series of parallel bands unrolled scenes commemorative, symbolical, or purely fantastic, all the work of the needle in 'opus plumarium.'

From these Ninevite embroideries we can trace two lines of imitative descent. The sculptures which preserved their design were themselves only an offshoot from it. The

decoration of royal robes was reproduced, on an enlarged scale, in the decoration of royal palaces. Nor is there any reason to doubt that personal preceded architectural splendour.

In the incised Phœnician bowls lately brought from Cyprus and Italy, again, the very same motives and the very same disposition of them reappear, as on Assyrian pectorals and robes of state. They show the characteristic arrangement in concentric bands, with frequently not so much resemblance as identity of character in figures and design. The material and mode of execution alone are changed; the directing idea survives.

Now a peculiar interest attaches to these Phœnician bowls. By their study much light has been thrown upon a problem of old standing in literature and archæology. M. Clermont-Ganneau has pointed out* how in the vase or 'cup of Pales-*'trina*' the successive scenes of the action present themselves as if by the unfolding of a scroll, precisely as do the *tableaux vivants* of the shield of Achilles. In both, space is made, as it were, to do duty for time; contiguity stands for succession; the fundamental limitation of plastic art to a single representative moment is ignored with unconscious *naïveté*. Some such work of a Sidonian graver of metals was doubtless before the poet's mind when he set the forge of Hephaistos glowing at the prayer of Thetis. The analogy is far too close to have been purely accidental. Given the additional idea of a world picture—one, as we have seen, familiar to textile art—and it becomes absolutely perfect. The famous Homeric description is thus, by no far-fetched inference, brought into close connexion with Assyrian embroideries; and the patient work of the needle is seen to have attained, by a twofold translation, to the immortality of golden verse.

Similar influences affected Egyptian wall paintings. At first substituted for draperies, they not unfrequently imitated what they replaced. The similarity of method is shown by the marking out into squares of the spaces for subsequent colouring, so as to produce the semblance of a magnified canvas, as if for the reception of a pattern in cross stitching.† At Saccarah, moreover, the brush has faithfully reproduced on the walls of a tomb the decorative effect of gay mattings, variegated with the zigzags, chequers, and lozenges even now

* *L'Imagerie Phénicienne*, 1^{re} partie, p. xxxi.

† Semper, '*Der Stil*,' Bd. I. p. 185.

in fashion; * and precisely the same kind of ornamentation in terracotta was found by Mr. Loftus on a ruined wall of the old Biblical city of Erech in Mesopotamia.† Traces of such imitations are widely diffused. The stars and garlands originally woven in carpets were reproduced in relief on the pavements of Assyrian palaces; while to this day Egyptian cross-stitch embroideries, transmitted through mosaics, reappear, scarcely modified, in the encaustic tilings of modern edifices and the floorcloths of our passages and kitchens. Tyre is desolate; the civilisation of the Pharaohs has perished. But the designs in which Egyptian women embroidered the sails of Tyrian ships when Isaiah lifted his voice to declare and lament the downfall of the great mercantile city of antiquity, show no signs of superannuation.

Lady Marian Alford has an interesting chapter on the origin and transformations of such longlived suggestions of a primitive fancy.

'The oldest patterns,' she remarks, 'had each a meaning and an intention. When a pattern has been enduring and far-spread it is because it was originally the expression of an idea or a symbol. In the earliest dawn of civilisation the arts were the repositories of the myths and mysteries of national faiths. Embroidery was one of these arts, and the border which edged the garment of a divinity, the veil which covered the grave of a loved one, or the flower buds and fruit which fringed the hangings and curtains in the sanctuary, each had a meaning, and therefore a use. These symbolical designs and forms were constantly reproduced, and all human ingenuity was exercised in reforming, remodelling, and adding perfect grace to the expression of the same idea.' (*'Needlework as Art,'* p. 85.)

Ancient architecture was dependent, as we have seen, upon textile art for organic completeness; it was also largely a borrower from it of ornamental motives. The question of priority in the possession of patterns can rarely be decided; but the presumption is generally in favour of the needle or the loom as the original instrument of their execution. There can scarcely be a doubt that this was so with the perpetually recurring 'knop and flower' design of Oriental fabrics. Starting from the Nile as a border of alternating lotus flowers and buds, it became naturalised in Assyrian art, borrowing a pomegranate form in Yarkand and the homa form from Persia; spread to India, where the

* Perrot et Chipiez, '*Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité,*' tom. i. p. 807.

† *Travels in Chaldæa and Susiana,* p. 188.

'knop' or bud developed into the cone of Cashmere and Paisley shawls, became hellenised as the 'honeysuckle and palmetto' of Ionic temples, and was thence transmitted to our builders, cabinet makers, and ironmongers. The Renaissance 'shell,' and the classical 'egg and tongue,' and 'tongue 'and dart' patterns are branches from the same stem.* Again, the mystical 'tree of life' design was copied in stone above the prehistoric gateway of Mycenæ, where, however, a fire altar is substituted for the sacred plant, and lions rampant take the place of the cheetahs of Indian fabrics, the gazelles of Egypt, the winged genii and bulls of Assyria, the peacocks of Byzantium. Just such leonine adoration is paid to a shrub of homa on an enamelled gold vase said to have been a gift from Harûn-ar-Raschîd to Charlemagne, and now kept in the abbey of St. Maurice (Valais); and the motive was even adopted in mediæval sculptures, as, for instance, in the tympanum of a church at Marigny.† We are inevitably reminded of the visionary architecture of Ezekiel's Temple, in which (not without profound significance) 'there were cherubim and palm trees wrought, so 'that a palm tree was between a cherub and a cherub.' The date palm, it may be remarked, was the Babylonian 'tree of life.'

Oriental art was essentially symbolical, consequently unprogressive. It partook of the nature of hieroglyphics. Its appeal was primarily to the understanding. Its purpose was significative far more than representative. Technical skill was hence in a manner superfluous to it, serving only to divert the mind from what lay behind the veil of sense.

The Greeks, on the contrary, discarded symbolism while adopting the forms in which it had been conveyed. It is surprising how little they actually invented. There is scarcely a wrought moulding on their temples, or a painted ornament on their vases, but has a pre-Hellenic history. But they embellished what they borrowed. Divesting it of allusive meaning, they gave it instead the supreme grace of beautiful form. This is especially visible in their system of architectural decoration. Patterns copied from Assyrian and Egyptian textiles, pottery, and buildings, while gaining a classic perfection of outline, finally lost hold of their generative ideas. The 'wave' pattern no longer suggested the

* Birdwood, 'Industrial Arts of India,' vol. ii. p. 166.

† Lenormant, 'Mélanges d'Archéologie' (Cahier et Martin), tom. iii. p. 126.

summer ripple or the foaming wintry rage of the sea; the 'mæander' renounced for ever its (somewhat problematical) connexion with Chinese wicker work; the Persian aster, cut off from solar associations, became a simple rosette; the Egyptian sunflower (the lotus) was transformed into a non-descript 'honeysuckle;' traditional significance was everywhere effaced by an instinctive adaptation to the office of frankly pleasing the eye.

An old tradition of indebtedness to textile design in another branch of Greek art, is worth preserving, if not for instruction, at least for curiosity. The opinion is stated to have been held by Aristarchus, and was approved by Eustathius, that the chief scenes of the *Iliad* were mere transcriptions from the pictured tapestries of Helen!* An extravagance, we may safely say, of early commentators; yet modern critics do not all or altogether deny some primitive historic value to woven or embroidered records.

Homeric heroines, divine and human, were, as everybody knows, famous for their industry. Even Circe and Calypso, though not otherwise estimable characters, were at least no idlers. In the intervals of spreading snares for the souls of men, they worked at the loom with a will, solacing their toil with such strange thrilling song as shook the hearts of the luckless companions of Ulysses. As for Helen, she might have successfully competed with Arachne, Philomela, or the Witch of Atlas—

' Broidering the pictured poesy
Of some high tale upon her growing woof,
Which the sweet splendour of her smiles could dye
In hues outshining heaven—and ever she
Added some grace to the wrought poesy.'

So the daughter of Zeus smiled and wrought—lonely, in the midst of Priam's large but censorious family, hated and self-scorning and loveless. Art—the only form of art open to women—was her consolation. The deeds done in her cause by 'armour-clad Achaians' and 'horse-taming Trojans' she recorded, as they daily passed under her eyes, in a 'magic 'web of colours gay.' As to her precise mode of working we are ill informed. The poet speaks only of a 'great loom;' but no loom in that age was capable of such elaborate performances. A stripe or a chequer might be produced with it; assuredly not a picture.

Homer was probably unfamiliar with the processes of

* Rossignol, '*Des Artistes Homériques*,' p. 73.

work with the needle; he indeed nowhere mentions that useful little implement. Embroideries were to him a foreign article of luxury. No Greek woman, either in Iliad or Odyssey, except Helen, who was semi-divine and had travelled much abroad, is represented as capable of their production. Even in Troy the art was an uncommon one. Hecuba's perfumed closet was stored with decorated robes wrought by Sidonian captives. Andromache, it is true, wove flower-besprinkled garments;* but the expression descriptive of them seems as if designedly chosen to set strict limits to her proficiency. Penelope's fame rests on her diligence and craft; the shroud of Laertes was nowise remarkable as a monument of artistic skill. A painting on a Greek vase, several hundred years after date, is the only authority for attributing to it any but the simplest construction. Thus the value of the Spartan queen's gift to Telemachus was enhanced by its rarity. It 'shone like a star;' and stars, though sufficiently gregarious in the sky, are affirmed in song to 'dwell apart.' Even in Olympian circles, where time was no object, and a goddess's *trousseau* may be supposed to have been almost as immortal as herself, a vesture adorned by Athene, as embroideress-in-chief, was not regarded as one for everyday wear.

On the whole, we seem bound to conclude that Helen and Andromache used the loom first and their needles afterwards. Tapestry weaving, or the art of pictorially disposing the threads of the woof, was originally an imitation of embroidery: it succeeded and to a great extent superseded it; but it was of comparatively late introduction.

It has been asserted, though, as it appears to us, on insufficient grounds, that Homer was acquainted with the textile use of gold. It is nevertheless certain that it was known at an epoch long anterior to his. Beaten out thin, and cut into strips, after the manner still practised in China, the precious metal entered into the decoration of Aaron's sacred vestments; and no form of splendour in dress was, in later ages, more constantly or more widely favoured. The women of Crotona, exhorted by Pythagoras, dedicated their 'aureate vests' in the temple of Juno. Tarquinius Priscus,

'All in gold, as he great Jove had been,'

rode triumphantly into Rome after defeating the Sabines; a linen corslet, adorned with gold and cotton, and in-

* Iliad, xxii. 441.

wrought with figures of animals, was presented by Amasis, King of Egypt, to the Lacedæmonians, and a gold-embroidered tiara by Xerxes to the city of Abdera,* nor among the spoils of Persepolis was there any richer booty than the cloths of gold laid up there.

Of mixed gold and wool were the 'Attalic stuffs' woven at Pergamus, as the result of the invention by King Attalus of a woof of gold-enwrapt threads. Propertius speaks of the 'noble Attalic curtains' draping the portico of Pompey's theatre, of which the velarium, ordered by Nero, displayed on a firmament of golden stars, 'needle painted' (*acu picta*), a portrait of the Emperor driving a chariot;† and Silius Italicus enumerates among the plundered splendours of Syracuse,‡ Attalic tapestries 'inscribed with the needle.'

The example of such splendours was contagious, and the triumph of Marcellus marked an epoch in the corruption of Rome. The pomps of the Capitol and the Via Triumphalis gradually spread downward from official to private life. The 'toga picta' embroidered in gold with palm fronds had been chosen as significant of victory; the 'scutulata vestis,' woven with borders of curiously diversified network anticipatory of modern lace, was adopted as distinctive of condition.§ New materials were imported, and the old refined and elaborated. India brought her muslins, Cos and Sidon their silks, to market in the metropolis of the world; Milesian and Pamphylian wool, white and choice enough to serve the fates for spinning the 'even thread' of the most favoured destiny, clothed the quondam nurslings of the she-wolf; the still unshorn fleeces of Attic and Tarentine sheep were covered with skins to improve their fineness, and 'oves pellitæ' became a recognised branch of husbandry. Persian carpets, such as Agamemnon had recoiled from treading upon as fit only for the gods, decked the vestibules of plain Roman citizens; for a single set of Babylonian hangings Metellus Scipio paid 800,000 sesterces (equal to 6,720*l.* of our money), and the price had quintupled in the reign of Nero; costly tapestries strewed couches, seats, tables, draped porticos and entrances, canopied atria and peristyles. The art of embroidery, introduced from Asia Minor, and hence known as 'opus Phrygium,' was in high repute. Embroi-

* Herodotus, iii. 47, and viii. 120.

† Ronchaud, 'La Tapisserie,' p. 90.

‡ Punicorum lib. xiv. 659.

§ Dupont-Auberville, 'L'Ornement des Tissus,' p. 6.

derers, more especially when they worked in gold, were generically termed 'Phrygiones;' and by a 'Phrygian vest,' such as Andromache gave to Ascanius, was understood one highly wrought with the needle. A reminiscence of this Asiatic origin survives in the English word 'orphrey' (corrupted from 'auriphrygium,' and first found, according to Lady M. Alford, in Domesday Book), signifying the gold-wrought border of a sacerdotal vestment.

Luxury in dress rose to a still higher pitch after the removal of the seat of empire to Byzantium. The examples of Ctesiphon and Dastagerd were successfully emulated. Ossa was heaped upon Pelion in the effort at decoration. A man became a moving picture gallery. Children stopped in the streets to stare at the grotesque objects portrayed on the robes of persons of quality. The pious indeed affected Biblical representations, and it is stated that no less than 600 figures illustrative of the Gospel narrative crowded the flowing garment of one Christian senator in the fourth century. In general, however, the style was neo-Babylonian, which varied only in the direction of added extravagance from that of the Ninevite sculptures. An unshackled Oriental fancy revelled in subjects from animal life, regarded now in its purely natural, now in its symbolical aspect, or under some strange disguise of monstrously combined forms.

The 'belluata tapetia' of Babylon had long been famous; and Bagdad, notwithstanding the prescriptions of the Koran, was the heir to much of the splendour and not a few of the traditions of the city of Semiramis. There were produced the rich silk and gold brocades of mediæval renown, called in English *baudekin*, in Italian *baldacchino* ('Baldach' was the old form of Bagdad). The canopy of an altar thus retains, in the latter tongue, undivided possession of an appellation originally bestowed upon its material. Samples of these gorgeous textures were amongst the presents sent to Charlemagne by Harûn-ar-Raschîd.

Silk weaving was already a Chinese monopoly of fully 2,500 years' standing, when about 300 B.C. it began to be practised by Asiatic Greeks. A woman named Pamphile, a native of the island of Cos, is mentioned by Aristotle as the originator of the new industry, and 'Coan vests' were in the highest vogue with Roman ladies when Varro wrote and Propertius and Tibullus elegised. Yet it was not until the thirteenth century that the manufacture of 'seric' stuffs took root on the Italian mainland, although long previously

introduced by its Saracen conquerors into Sicily. The 'Tiraz' of Palermo was an old-established institution when King Roger in 1148 reformed its methods by the importation of Theban and Corinthian artisans; and, in fact, an *atelier* for weaving and decorating the robes of state freely used as insignia of honour, was an indispensable part of the dependencies of every Mussulman court.*

The outburst of iconoclastic fanaticism towards the middle of the eighth century had a powerful effect in diffusing a knowledge of Byzantine art through Western Europe. Artists and embroiderers, persecuted or unemployed, fled to Rome for custom and protection. Their dispersal foreshadowed the exodus compelled by Turkish conquest seven centuries later, and brought with it a sort of premonitory renaissance. One immediate result was a notable accession to the richness of ecclesiastical decoration. Chroniclers became eloquent in their details of textile gifts from the Popes to various churches. Stephen IV. for instance, in 768, presented, for the arcades of St. Peter's, fifty-six hangings of figured Tyrian purple; he draped the great entrance with massive curtains of woven silver, and added to his donations a vestment wrought in gold and gems with the deliverance of the Apostle. It was not, however, until the ninth century that the symbolism of the Oriental 'Bestiarium' gained full admittance to the sanctuary. Unicorns, griffins, lions, peacocks, eagles, elephants, then made copious appearances on chasubles, copes, and pallia. Only the *shikargahs*, or 'happy hunting ground' brocades of Benares, recall, at the present day, this efflorescence of animal portraiture. A favourite design was that of a man riding on a peacock—typical, it may be surmised, of predestination, since the bird was the admitted figure of eternal glory in the zoological system of representation. As such, and perhaps also not without an eye to purely temporal gorgeousness, it was much in fashion by the Bosphorus. Constantine Porphyrogenitus relates that the great officers of the Byzantine Court were obliged, at Christmas, to wear robes decorated with peacocks;† and the 'vow of the peacock' was of solemn import in chivalric and crusading times.

Meanwhile, side by side with these imported extravagances, a new style of purely Christian ornamentation was unfolding its capabilities. 'Born in the catacombs,' says Lady Marian

* Amari, 'Storia de' Musulmani in Sicilia,' tom. iii. p. 448.

† *Mélanges d'Archéologie*, tom. ii. p. 243, *note*.

Alford, 'roused by impulses from the north, by education in the south, and everywhere encouraged by the fostering hand of the Church, and the patronage of papal and of royal and imperial houses, it evolved its forms, and emancipated itself at last from its poor and sordid condition'—emancipated itself, it may be added, under Eastern influence of a purer, stronger, and more enduring kind than that of court fashion in dress. The noblest monument of this early phase of church embroidery is without doubt the dalmatic said to have been worn by Charlemagne when he sang the Gospel at High Mass in St. Peter's on the day of his coronation, December 24, 800. We quote, with slight abridgement, our authoress's description of this valuable specimen, still preserved, apparently little the worse for its age of eleven centuries, in the sacristy of St. Peter's.

'There has been much controversy as to the date of the dalmatic of Charlemagne in the Vatican treasury. Like every good early piece of Gothic work in Italy, it is allotted to the days of Pope Boniface VIII. But when we examine this splendid relic we cannot doubt that it is of a much earlier time, as there is nothing Gothic to be found in it. It is full of the lingering traces of Greek art (not Byzantine). It reminds us most of the mosaics of Santa Pudenziana, which are always quoted to prove that Greek art still survived in Rome in the eighth century. The dalmatic has been much restored, but, I believe, most carefully kept to the old lines. It is worked on a thick dark blue or purple satiny silk, which had entirely fallen into little strips, but has been skilfully mended, and the embroidery has never been transferred. On the front is our Lord in glory, saints below, and angels above, with a border of children playing which is truly Greek. The motive of this is the "Ibi et Ubi." On the back is the Transfiguration, and on the humerals are the sacraments (*sic*) of bread and wine. The whole, as art, is beautiful, and it is historically most interesting. Lord Lindsay tells us that in the dalmatic of Charlemagne (called that of Leo III.) Cola di Rienzi robed himself over his armour, and ascended to the Palace of the Popes after the manner of the Cæsars, with sounding trumpets before him, and followed by his horsemen—his crown on his head and his truncheon in his hand—"Terribile e fantastico."

'This dalmatic must be ranked first and highest among ecclesiastical embroideries. Some of the details are curious. The whole of the blue satin ground is worked with crosses "*parsemé*." Parts of the design are so adorned with larger and smaller Greek crosses, and others with the starry cross. On the shoulder is once embroidered the mystic *zwastika*.* Signor Galletti, Professor of Embroidery to

* Precisely similar ornaments occur on the mantle of Achilles, represented as playing at dice with Ajax, on a celebrated Greek vase

the Pope, says it is undoubtedly of the eighth century. It has been suggested that the design is of the date of the Exarchate. It is, however, something of infinitely finer style; it is noble, simple Greek.

'Charlemagne's dalmatic is embroidered mostly in gold, the draperies in basket work and laid stitches, the faces in white silk split stitch, flat, with finely drawn outlines in black silk. The hair, the shadowy part of the draperies, and the clouds are worked in fine gold and silver thread with dark outlines. The hands, feet, and draperies have a fine bas-relief effect.' (*'Needlework as Art,'* pp. 317-319, pls. 53, 54, 55.)

A 'Legend of Good Women,' including all the better-famed embroideresses of history, would not come quickly to an end, although by its profession bound to omit such unlucky examples as Helen, Arachne, Dido, Philomela, 'dread 'Persephone,' Thorgunna of unholy repute in Icelandic saga, Gudrun the Scandinavian Medea, the Lady of Shalott, and the norn-like daughters of Regner Lodbrok. But the Christian centuries brought better inspirations than underlay the tragic webs of pagan times. First among ecclesiastical art needlewomen was St. Helena, mother of Constantine, claimed in the Principality as a native of the land of leeks. A figure of the Madonna still to be seen at Vercelli is stated (very doubtfully, it must be admitted) to have been embroidered by her; and an inventory of the treasures of Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, names a 'rich and 'ancient' altar cloth, of which the decoration was ascribed to the first Christian empress.*

In the eighth century, 'Berthe aux grands pieds' had not a superior in the use of the needle 'from Tours to Cambrai,' and her son Charlemagne caused his daughters to be carefully trained to similar proficiency.† Some two centuries later, Gisela, Queen of St. Stephen of Hungary, founded at her court a school of textile art from which sprang a new kind of plumage stitch known as 'Hungarian Point,' and embroidered the coronation robe of her husband with her own hands in the highest liturgical style. Thrown into the bog of Orsava during the revolution under Kossuth, this beautiful work suffered irreparable injury; it was, nevertheless, not only recovered and restored, but worn by the present

in the Etruscan Museum at the Vatican. '*Needlework as Art,'* p. 318, note, and pl. 26. The prehistoric 'zwastika' is now the universal Buddhist spell against the evil eye.

* Bock, '*Liturgische Gewänder,'* Bd. I. p. 193.

† Mrs. Bury Palliser's '*History of Lace,'* 3rd ed. p. 4.

Emperor at the imposing ceremonial of his coronation at Pesth. It is now in the Imperial Treasury of Buda, and its original design, drawn on linen and carefully coloured, may be seen in the Benedictine convent of Martinsburg, near Raab, in Hungary.*

The annals of our own country teem with parallel examples. Queen Edgitha adorned with gold the state robes of the Confessor, and directed a workroom from which emanated elaborate church embroideries. Queen Emma, when the wife of Canute, worked an altar cloth on shot blood-red and green silk (a kind of material then produced at Tinnis in Egypt), with golden orphreys at the side and across the top.† Designs to be executed with the needle of the pious and noble Saxon lady Ethelwynne were prepared by St. Dunstan, who when a youth was accustomed to play on the harp before her and her maidens as they sat at work. Ælfleda, widow of the Northumbrian chieftain Brithnoth, wrought the story of his achievements against the Danes upon a curtain presented to the minster church at Ely, where his headless body lay.‡ Such instances might be almost indefinitely multiplied; but we pause.

Our readers will naturally expect to find a foremost place amongst royal art workers assigned to Matilda, wife of the Conqueror; it is however at least as doubtful whether she was concerned with the production of the Bayeux tapestry as whether Laura decorated with her own fair fingers the daintily embroidered glove to which Petrarch dedicated the raptures and regrets of three sonnets.

‘The Bayeux tapestry,’ Lady M. Alford remarks, ‘is worked in worsted on linen; the design is perfectly flat and shadowless. The outlines are firmly drawn with cords on thickly set stem stitches. The surfaces are laid in flat stitch. Though coarsely worked, there is a certain “maestria” in the execution.’ Thus, the word ‘tapestry’ as applied to it is a misnomer. It is neither more nor less than a huge piece of crewel embroidery 230 feet long by twenty inches wide. The worsteds used are of eight tints, apportioned without close consultation with nature. Horses, for instance, are by turns blue, green, red, and yellow. There is no attempt at perspective, though some partial hints

* We quote almost *verbatim* from ‘Needlework as Art,’ p. 322. The merits of Queen Gisela’s design may be judged of from pl. 65, *op. cit.*

† *Ibid.* p. 366.

‡ Rock, ‘Textile Fabrics,’ p. cxvii.

at difference of distance are given in difference of hue.* Very curious are the fantastic animal friezes above and below the central procession of historical subjects—an arrangement recalling the famous peplos of Alcisthenes, reckoned by Aristotle amongst the 'Mirabilia' of the ancient world, on which the gods of Greece were echeloned between the fauna of Persia and Susiana.

There seems no room for doubt that the Bayeux tapestry is of contemporary origin with the events it depicts. Architecture, dresses, furniture, armour, accoutrements, are those of the eleventh century. And since artists were not in those times archæologists, this evidence is decisive. The tradition connecting Queen Matilda with its origin is, we are driven to conclude, more appropriate than true. The probable view appears to be that the tapestry was a gift to the cathedral of his diocese from Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, brother of William the Conqueror, and was executed in that town.† From its annual use for draping the nave of the church during the octave of St. John the Baptist, it received the local designation of the 'Toile de St. Jean.' Father Montfaucon drew learned attention to it in 1730; it survived the Revolution by a hairbreadth escape from employment as the cover of a military waggon; was exhibited at the Musée Napoléon in 1803, when it was visited by the First Consul, and became the subject of a comedy; and was finally, notwithstanding the just reclamations of the cathedral clergy, placed in the custody of the municipality of Bayeux, where it now remains.

The early excellence of English needlework is a matter of some surprise. There seems, at first sight, nothing to account for it. The convulsions of a nascent kingdom can have left little leisure for artistic culture. Communications with the centres of traditional practice were slow and scanty. Yet there is no trace of insular barbarism in our earliest native productions. They already attest a beautiful and original developement of the new style of Christian art, which, taking its rise at Constantinople, spread under ecclesiastical influence to the Wall of Agrippa and the Ultima Thule of Iceland. In the volume before us, this branch of the subject is treated with so much knowledge and fulness, that we the more willingly recur to its authority.

'In the eighth century' ('Needlework as Art,' p. 363) 'our

* Fowke, 'The Bayeux Tapestry,' p. 12.

† Fowke, *op. cit.* p. 173.

English work in illuminations and embroideries was finer than that of any Continental school; and therefore, in view of the great advance of these secondary arts, we may claim that we were then no longer outer barbarians, though our only acknowledged superiority over Continental artists was in the workrooms of our women and the cells of our religious houses. During the terrible incursions of the Danes, and the many troubles that accrued from these barbarous and idolatrous invaders, the convents and monasteries, especially those of the Order of St. Benedict, kept the sacred flame of art burning. Both monks and nuns wrote, illuminated, painted, and embroidered. They evidently continued their relations with foreign art, for it is difficult to say at what period the Norman style began to be introduced into England. It was the outcome of the Romanesque, and of this different phases must have come to us through the Danes and the Saxons.

'I cannot but dwell on the early life and springtime of our Anglican Christian art, which in many points preceded and surpassed that of other northern nations, as we arose from that period commonly called the Dark Ages. Ours was a gradual developement, adding to itself from outer sources new strength and grace. The better perfection of details and patterns was succeeded by Anglo-Saxon ingenuity and refinement in drawing the human figure. The art, which was native to England, may be judged by the rare examples that we possess, and of which we may well be proud; though we must remember with shame how much was destroyed at the Reformation. Enough, however, remains to prove that our English art of illumination of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries was very beautiful, and we are not surprised, therefore, to find in the embroideries of that period grace and artistic feeling.'

These are abundantly attested by the stole and maniple now in the chapter library at Durham. Presented by *Ælfleda*, queen of *Edward the Elder*, early in the tenth century, to *Frithestan*, Bishop of Winchester, they were with other ornaments subsequently dedicated by *Athelstan* to the shrine of *St. Cuthbert* at *Chester-le-Street*, whence they were removed in 1827. They are, according to our authoress, 'of the most perfect style of Anglo-Saxon design; and the stitching of the silk embroidery and of the gold grounding are of the utmost perfection of needlework art.'

'Of the twelfth century (1170),' she continues, 'we have the robes and mitres of *Thomas à Becket* at *Sens*; and another mitre of the period, white and gold, is in the museum at *Munich*, with his martyrdom embroidered on one side and that of *St. Stephen* on the other. The gold needlework is so perfect that it resembles weaving. It is recorded that a splendid dress was embroidered in *London* for *Elinor* of *Aquitaine* which cost 80*l.*, equal to 1,400*l.* of the value of to-day.' ('Needlework as Art,' p. 369.)

The 'pluvial of *St. Silvester*,' a thirteenth-century work
VOL. CLXIV. NO. CCCXXV. M

in the treasury of St. John Lateran, of which Lady M. Alford reproduces the refined and thoughtful design (plate 56), the similar object at Bologna (plate 58), and the 'Daroca Cope' at Madrid (plate 59), are all, from intrinsic evidence, claimed by her as English. Unmistakeable to a trained eye are the pillars of twisted vine stems, the peacock-feathered angels, the cherubim standing on wheels, the characteristic shrine work, visible in them; besides certain less definite though scarcely less assured peculiarities of drawing and stitching distinctive of '*Opus Anglicanum*.'

One of its most splendid specimens now forming part of the valuable collection of embroideries in the South Kensington Museum, is thus described in Dr. Rock's catalogue :

'The Syon Monastery Cope; ground green, with crimson interlacing barbed quatrefoils, inclosing figures of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Apostles, with winged cherubim standing on wheels in the intervening spaces, and the orphreys, morse, and hem wrought with armorial bearings; the whole done in gold, silver, and various coloured silks. English needlework, thirteenth century, 9 ft. 7 in. by 4 ft. 8 in.' ('*Textile Fabrica*,' p. 275.)

The origin of this vestment is, by surmise, referred to a convent at Coventry. There is good reason to believe that it was bestowed upon the nuns of Syon, near Isleworth, by one Dr. Thomas Graunt, an official in the ecclesiastical courts. With the exiled sisterhood it certainly travelled, in the reign of Elizabeth, through Flanders and France to Portugal; and from Lisbon, about seventy-five years ago, found its way back to England. It is in excellent preservation, and instructively illustrates the methods and manner of old English ecclesiastical embroidery.

This held itself for the most part aloof from the Moorish influences exerted upon other branches of textiles. Sicily was their principal channel; but they flowed through Spain as well. From Almeria and Malaga came fabrics distinguished with a kind of Saracenic trade mark in the shape of Arabic formulæ of piety or praise. This trade mark, too, was extensively counterfeited; as in the '*morys letters*' on '*a halling*' (hanging for a hall) '*of black, red, and green*,' bequeathed by Joan, Lady Bergavenny, in 1434; nor was there any more frequent device for the adornment of the cendals, sarcenets, and brocades of the Middle Ages, than counterfeit Arabic inscriptions.

In the Tiraz of Palermo, the needle held its place beside the loom. All its more elaborate productions, in fact, received their final embellishment by hand. Amongst these

was the sumptuous 'Pallium of Nuremberg' now at Vienna. It is a royal mantle of a semicircular shape, embroidered in gold and pearls with a group of a camel overthrown by the spring of a lion on either side of a tall palm tree.* An inscription in Cufic letters gives the name and quality of King Roger, with the date 1133. The design takes us straight to the ruins of Persepolis; and the presence of a considerable Persian element in the Moorish population of the island largely explains the dominance of Iranian traditions in Sicilian textile art. We meet with the homa gradually transformed into the pomegranate and artichoke patterns, the last figuring on the cloak of the Madonna in Crivelli's 'Enthronement,' as well as in other Italian pictures belonging to our national collection.† In connexion with, or replacement of, the sacred plant, there are instances of the delineation of the Zoroastrian fire altar,‡ precisely as in the sculpture above the 'lion gate' of Mycenæ; and even the worship of Mithra was not altogether neglected as a source of inspiration.

Persian, too, but of the Sassanide epoch, were the strong zoological proclivities of the later Sicilian school. Dragons, griffins, lions, sphinxes, dogs and winged harts, giraffes, gazelles, ran riot on Palermitan tissues; eagles aspired to the sun; the symbolical aster commemorated Persian reverence for the source of light. Just such are the modern 'kincobs' of Benares and Ahmedabad, and just such must have been the robe of 'red siclatoun' (a mediæval Persian fabric of silk and gold) worn by 'Florence of Rome' when she received the envoys of the aged Sir Garcy seated in pomp—

' By her father's side,
A coronel on her head sett,
Her clothes with beasts and birds were bete §
All about for pride.'

Three stages of decadence can be marked in the history of English art needlework, induced respectively by successful competition, civil disturbance, and religious change. The diffusion and excellence of Flemish tapestries in the thir-

* Bock, 'Kleinodien,' p. 27, pl. vi.; Amari, 'Storia de' Musulmani in Sicilia,' tom. iii. p. 448.

† Rock, 'Textile Fabrics,' p. cxxxi.

‡ Lenormant, 'Mélanges' (Cahier et Martin), tom. iii. p. 123.

§ I.e. embroidered with *beaten* gold. See Ritson's 'Ancient English Metrical Romances,' vol. iii. p. 8.

teenth century first curtailed its credit and its vogue; the Wars of the Roses broke the continuity of its traditions; the Reformation abolished its main purpose, and scattered the religious communities amongst whom it had been fostered. Its decay left room for the temporary but brilliant success of the Mortlake tapestries, brought into existence by the patronage of James I. They included some fine copies of Raphael's cartoons from the Acts of the Apostles, themselves picked up, by the advice of Rubens, in the lumber room of a Brussels factory. These rare specimens of English art weaving are now in the Garde Meuble at Paris, having been purchased by Mazarin at the sale of the effects of Charles I.* They are embellished with rich borders, from drawings, it is thought, by Vandyck. For the Mortlake establishment, too, Rubens painted his six sketches of the 'Story of Achilles.' But it survived the Protectorate with waning vitality, and perished, in straitened circumstances, in 1703, leaving the Maison des Gobelins in possession of the field.

The position of embroidery in our own time may fitly be described as that of an art on the retired list. It still lives, and it has a sphere of usefulness, though a narrowly restricted one; but there is little probability of its ever again being called out for active service. Serious function is of the very essence of the life of art; and a serious function can hardly now be claimed for decorative needlework. It is an elegant pastime, no longer an earnest pursuit. The days are past beyond recall when Paolo da Verona could count twenty-six years of his life well spent in embroidering, from designs by Pollaiuolo, a single set of vestments for Dante's 'bel San Giovanni;' when two silken mantles 'of incomparable workmanship' were worth the land of three families,† or Innocent III. dubbed England a 'garden of delight' because of its orphreys, copes, and chasubles.

The old unsophisticated taste for gorgeous apparel, too, we moderns leave to women and savages; very few men of Aryan descent, we imagine, would now care to divide with Helio-gabalus the burden of pleasure imposed by the wearing of fine clothes. We cannot figure to ourselves without a smile the winner of the Queen's Prize enveloped in a cloak radiant with purple and pictured in gold, such as Æneas bestowed upon Cloanthus to recompense his victory in the 'regatta' of

* A. de Champeaux, 'Tapestry,' p. 50.

† Yates, 'Textrium Antiquorum,' p. 242.

Drepanum; the anachronism would be as glaring as the rifle of the Wimbledon champion placed in the hands of the master of the 'cærulean Scylla.'

Handwork, moreover, tends, in all departments of human labour, to become superseded by machinery; and although machinery is impotent for the production of works of art, it is powerful for their suppression. Jacquard's loom has invaded the already curtailed field of ornamentation with the needle, and relegated it to a position where its archæological interest is more apparent than its present usefulness. Hence the late revival of art embroidery in this country and in the United States* is due rather to a critical reconstruction of things as they might be, than to a spontaneous impulse arising out of things as they are. It is predetermined and thoughtful, not instinctive and irresistible. This, however, is no reason for rejecting or condemning it. It is good in itself; and though not the best absolutely, is the best relatively to uncontrollable circumstances. Whatever is worth doing at all, is worth any pains to do well. Ladies' fingers had far better be employed than idle, and it is no small thing to avoid at least the further debasement of taste as the result of their employment. The discernment of ugliness is a first step towards the perception of beauty; both faculties can be improved, though perhaps not wholly acquired; and if within recent years something has been done towards their wider developement amongst ourselves, it is largely due to such well-directed and disinterested efforts as are borne witness to in the book we now take leave of.

* For an account of the beautiful 'needlewoven tapestry' introduced by Mrs. Candace Wheeler at New York, see an article signed 'S. R. Koehler' in the 'Magazine of Art' for March 1886.

- ART. VI.—1. *Les Mille et Une Nuits*. Contes Arabes, traduits par A. GALLAND. 1704.
2. *Les Mille et Une Nuits*. Contes Arabes, traduits par A. GALLAND et continués par CAUSSIN DE PERCEVAL. 9 vols. Paris: 1806.
3. *The Arabian Nights Entertainments*. With an introduction by JONATHAN SCOTT, LL.D. 1811. Reprint, 1883.
4. *Contes inédits des Mille et Une Nuits*. Extraits de M. DE HAMMER, traduits par G. S. TRÉBUTIEN. 3 vols. Paris: 1828.
5. *The Book of the Thousand Nights and One Night*. Done into English by H. TORRENS. Vol. I. Calcutta: 1838.
6. *The Thousand and One Nights, or Arabian Nights Entertainments*. Translated by EDWARD WILLIAM LANE. 3 vols. London: 1839–40. New edition, edited by EDWARD STANLEY POOLE, 1859. Reprinted 1883.
7. *Arabian Society in the Middle Ages*. Studies on ‘The ‘Thousand and One Nights.’ By E. W. LANE. Edited by STANLEY LANE-POOLE. 1883.
8. *Tausend und Eine Nacht*. Uebersetzt von G. Weil. Stuttgart: 1838–41.
9. *The Book of the Thousand Nights and One Night*. Now first completely done into English prose and verse from the original Arabic, by JOHN PAYNE. 9 vols. Printed for the Villon Society, for private circulation. London: 1882–84.
10. *Tales from the Arabic of the Breslau and Calcutta Editions of the Book of ‘The Thousand Nights and One Night.’* Now first done into English by JOHN PAYNE. 3 vols. Villon Society, for private circulation. 1884.
11. *Alf Leyla wa-Leyla*. Boulak: 1835.
12. *Tausend und Eine Nacht*. Arab. text. Ed. M. HABICHT and H. L. FLEISCHER. 12 vols. Breslau: 1825–43.
13. *Alif Laila*. Edited by Sir W. H. MACNAGHTEN. 4 vols. Calcutta: 1839–42.

THE devout Persian who desired to attain to the mystical joys of Sufism was not permitted immediately to enter the Holy of Holies; several stages of gradual initiation were required of the novice before he was deemed worthy to receive the full light of religion. In like manner we in

Europe have been given our 'Arabian Nights' in spoonfuls; we have been admitted step by step into the fairyland over which Queen Shehrazad reigns, and after a hundred and eighty years of partial exploration we have at last been allowed to traverse the whole country and survey its wonders even as far as the Mountains of Kaf, which bound its horizon, or as high as the Milky Way, where the angels continually sing the praises of Allah. This gentle process of initiation was begun by a Frenchman, continued by an Austrian, and ended by Englishmen. It was in 1704 that Antoine Galland, sometime of the French embassy at Constantinople, but then professor at the Collège de France, presented the world with the contents of an Arabic manuscript which he had brought from Syria, and which bore the title of 'The Thousand Nights and One Night.' The book was a revelation in romance, and took Europe by storm; it still is, and will always remain, a European classic. Before its appearance no one had so much as heard of the 'Arabian Nights,' and the unexpected store of fancy thus suddenly discovered was eagerly devoured by thousands of delighted readers. But it was not merely the matter that charmed people; the manner of the tales was equally captivating. Galland was a born story-teller, in the good and the bad sense; he possessed the gift of easy, skilful, effective narration, and he stuck at nothing to make his stories artistic; if the necessary details were not in his original he was quite ready to supply them from his own productive imagination. He had a bright, flexible style, admirably fitted for the purpose he had in view, lucid yet eloquent, smooth and polished without being over elaborate, yet longdrawn enough to suit the languorous indolence of Eastern life. It was no wonder that his version of the 'Arabian Nights' achieved a universal popularity and was translated into many languages, and that it provoked a crowd of imitations, from 'Les Mille et Un Jours' to the 'Tales of the Genii.' Considered from a Western point of view, and regarded simply as a story book, it is still held by many to be the most artistic version, the best literary paraphrase of the 'Nights' that exists.

A paraphrase, however, it is, and not a translation. Caussin de Perceval, a finished Arabic scholar, who in 1806 supplemented Galland's version with other tales, felt himself bound in conscience to explain to the readers of the 'Mille et Une Nuits' that they must not take it absolutely *au pied de la lettre*, and in order to explain his predecessor's

method he gave some specimens of a literal translation side by side with Galland's, and very surprising indeed were the differences between the two.* It was apparent that Galland had regarded the Arabic in the light of a bare body, which it was his mission to clothe with elegant garments of the best Parisian make. He did his tailoring extremely well, but when it was done the poor body was hardly to be recognised; it could not console itself with the reflection that 'cælum non animum mutat,' for it felt that everything besides climate was altered and that it was not the same man at all. As a professed translation Galland's 'Mille et 'Une Nuits' is an audacious fraud, though it is not the less the best story book in the world.

Not only is Galland's version in no true sense a translation, but it is not the 'Arabian Nights' as we now understand the book. His eight volumes do not contain more than a quarter, though the best quarter, of the 'Thousand and One 'Nights,' and on the other hand present a great deal that does not belong to the 'Nights' at all. The translator himself naïvely admits that a couple of tales had accidentally been interpolated from other sources without his knowledge—he does not explain how—yet these two are but a fraction of the foreign element incorporated in his version. With the exception of the 'Magic Horse,' and more doubtfully of the 'Sleeper Awakened,' the whole of the last fourteen tales have nothing whatever to do with the 'Nights.' To

* The reader may compare the following passage from Galland's version with Mr. Payne's literal rendering, in order to realise the extraordinary liberties which the worthy Frenchman permitted himself to take with the Arabic:—1. Galland (Scott's translation): 'My father joined in opinion with those of his brothers who had spoken in favour of Egypt; which filled me with joy. "Say what " "you will," said he, "the man that has not seen Egypt has not seen " "the greatest rarity in the world. All the land there is golden; I " "mean, it is so fertile that it enriches its inhabitants. All the women " "of that country charm you by their beauty and their agreeable " "carriage. If you speak of the Nile, where is there a more wonder- " "ful river? What water was ever lighter or more delicious? The " "very slime it carries along, in its overflowing, fattens the fields, " "which produce a thousand times more than other countries that are " "cultivated with the greatest labour. . . ."

2. Mr. Payne (vol. ix. p. 274): 'Quoth my father, "Who hath " "not seen Cairo hath not seen the world; its dust is gold and its " "women pictures; its Nile is a wonder, its waters light and sweet, " "and its mud a commodity and a medicine. . . ."

this day it remains a mystery whence these stories came. Honest Caussin, who was evidently a little scandalised, as became a true scholar, at the tricks which Galland had played with his original, confessed that for some of the later tales he was unable to discover any Arabic text whatever. The last volume of the Syrian manuscript from which Galland had nominally translated his version happened by a curious fatality to be lost, but calculations based on the volumes that remain show that without great disproportion of bulk it could not have contained half these missing tales. The mystery was the more to be regretted because two of the tales were the famous 'Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp' and 'Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves.' These two stories have never been discovered in any Eastern manuscript; they are not in Paris; they are not in the Wortley-Montague MS. in the Bodleian, of which Dr. Jonathan Scott stated that he had compared it with Galland's and found it to agree with his version—and therefore presumably to contain 'Aladdin' and 'Ali Baba.' There has been no lack of industry in searching for the missing tales, and now that the manuscript collections of Europe have been thoroughly explored by numerous and competent scholars we must take it as certain that the supposed manuscript originals do not exist. The late Professor Palmer, however, heard a story nearly resembling 'Ali Baba' told among the Arabs of Sinai, and there is no reason to suppose that the two most celebrated of the missing tales were deliberate forgeries. The most probable explanation seems to be either that Galland himself heard them orally related during his travels in the Levant, or that he employed an Oriental amanuensis, and that this assistant possessed in his memory a store of oral romances. This latter hypothesis may account for the mysterious insertion, already mentioned, of the tales of 'Zeyn al-Asnam,' 'Codadad,' and the 'Princess of Derya-bar,' for which Galland was unable to account. Wherever the missing tales came from, it is abundantly certain that they belong to no manuscript of the 'Thousand and One Nights.'

This formed the first stage of the initiation of Europe into the mysteries of the 'Nights.' It was a very charming and interesting introduction to them, but it was neither complete nor accurate. No one who knows the 'Nights' in the original can read Galland's paraphrase with patience, unless he can contrive to completely dissociate the two works and to regard the French adaptation as a wholly different book.

Nevertheless its literary merits, the absence of any rival, and the fact that its defects had not yet been discovered, gave the 'Mille et Une Nuits' a wide and a deserved popularity. All our ordinary English versions are merely translations from it. Now and then the title pages of these cheap editions contain words that appear to indicate that they have been newly translated from the original; but the original in all such cases is the French, not the Arabic. The first English edition was published (*pace* Lowndes) within eight years of Galland's, and a second appeared in 1712; they consisted in a close translation of Galland; and though several editors tried their hands at improving the English (among whom the Rev. E. Forster was the most successful) the differences between one edition and another are slight, and all are merely variants of the 'original' French. We are far from writing contemptuously of these popular editions. They have been the delight of generations of English children for the better part of two centuries, and will, we hope, continue to hold their own in the nursery for ages to come, though the children of to-day seem to be too refined and too *blasés* to enjoy the wholesome fare on which their great-grandparents were reared. But so long as a good story book is appreciated, Galland will hold his place, and many of us who have been brought up on him will probably continue to prefer the old favourite, with all his excrescences and shortcomings, to the most scholarly and complete translation that the heart of Orientalist can conceive.

Galland did not long remain without followers and imitators. Cazotte published his 'Suite des Mille et une Nuits,' a barefaced forgery, in 1785. In 1800 Dr. Jonathan Scott, whilom Persian Secretary to the Governor-General of Bengal, published some 'Tales translated from the 'Arabic of the Thousand and One Nights' in a volume of 'Tales, Anecdotes, and Letters;' but the stories in question are a mixed collection from a late MS.; several of them are not part of the 'Arabian Nights,' and the genuine additions are unimportant. In 1811 Dr. Scott brought out an English translation of Galland, which he, indeed, professed to have collated with the Arabic, but which is really wholly unrevised. This edition was tastefully reprinted by Messrs. Nimmo and Bain in four volumes in 1883. Dr. Scott added nothing substantial to the 'Nights' as revealed by Galland. Caussin de Perceval, in 1806, edited Galland's version, and added various other tales; but hardly any of

these belonged to the 'Arabian Nights.' Von Hammer was the first to translate the genuine tales which were wanting in the old paraphrase. Unfortunately his version, which was written in French, was accidentally lost, though not before the MS. had been done into German by Zinserling; from which German version M. Trébutien retranslated the work into French. It appeared in three volumes in 1828, and the Rev. G. Lamb turned most of it into English in 1829. The Hammer-Trébutien version comprises all the tales omitted by Galland; but it is hardly a translation; the stories are abridged considerably, and, in deference to Galland's example, the language of the original is paraphrased with excessive freedom.

It was not till a hundred and thirty years had made Galland a household friend that Henry Torrens, a civilian in the East India Company's Bengal service, published a first volume of considerable merit (though Captain Burton finds his style characterised by a 'hag-like nakedness') at Calcutta in 1838, but stopped when he learnt that another version was in progress. Edward William Lane, who came afterwards to be acknowledged as the greatest Arabic scholar of his time, had been working at the 'Thousand and 'One' with a celebrated sheykh in Cairo, and in 1839-40 his classical translation appeared in parts, and was at once recognised as an altogether new departure. Lane's object was to produce such a translation as should, without being absolutely complete, comprise all that was best in the original, and to write it in such a manner that the Oriental tone of the 'Nights' should be reflected in the English. The reasons for omitting a part of the original were twofold. Lane addressed his translation to the general public of both sexes, and there is much in the 'Nights' that is absolutely inadmissible among such an audience. The greater portion of Lane's excisions are dictated by this motive, with which no one will quarrel save a few pedants of these latter days who consider that whatever is natural is right and must forthwith be proclaimed upon the housetops. By the omission of such tales as 'The Merchant of Oman,' 'The Crafty Delila,' 'Kamar-ez-Zeman and the Jeweller's 'Wife,' and 'Mesroure,' none of which could be purified without being destroyed, Lane was able to produce a version which could be put into anyone's hands. Had he translated the complete 'Nights' the book would have been open to prosecution.

The other motive for Lane's excisions was less justifiable

in theory, but not less practically sensible. He excluded five or six tales because they were either long and dreary or were to a large extent repetitions of incidents already narrated in other parts of the 'Nights.' We are not sure that some of these omissions were not mistaken. We should have liked to see the short stories of 'Abdallah the Son of Fazil' and 'Abul-Hasan of Khorasan' retained, despite their similarity to previous tales; and 'The Queen of the Serpents,' with the subordinate stories of 'Bulukiya' and 'Jamshah,' might with advantage have been preserved. The longest story omitted by Lane is that of 'Omar the Son of 'No'man,' which occupies two hundred pages of Mr. Payne's edition. It is an interminable rambling narrative of conflicts between Amazons and Greeks, various anti-crusading incidents, and not a few passages of a very disagreeable nature. Remembering that after all the 'Arabian Nights' is primarily and principally a story book, Lane was right to exclude a tale which is, as a whole, so very unreadable. Yet there are some singularly striking and graphic scenes in it which we are sorry to miss; and a careful abridgement of the tale of 'Omar' would have been a valuable addition to Lane's translation, inasmuch as it would have shown a side of the 'Nights' which is not elsewhere conspicuous. The only other important tale omitted by Lane—not on grounds of delicacy—is that of 'Tawaddud, the Learned 'Slave Girl';' and here we cannot quarrel with him. In a popular version of the 'Nights' one would as soon have included the 'Longer Catechism of Westminster' as its Shafi'ite equivalent, the learned expositions of this redoubtable young theologian. On the whole, then, the reader has lost very much less than he has been given to understand by Lane's excisions. Captain Burton, for example, records his opinion that Lane has omitted 'half, and by far the more characteristic half,' of the 'Arabian Nights;' but Captain Burton has a talent for exaggeration, and for 'characteristic' we should read 'unclean.' It is natural that he should make the most of such omissions, since they form the *raison d'être* of his own translation; but he has widely overshoot the mark, and the public may rest assured that the tales omitted from the standard version are of very slight importance in comparison with the tales included in it.

Besides the tales proper the 'Arabian Nights' includes, as everybody knows, a large number of anecdotes, fables, and the like, inserted between the longer stories, with which they have no connexion. There are over four hundred of

these in the complete text, and Lane has not translated much more than two hundred. Yet he might with advantage have omitted many more. These anecdotes form no essential part of the 'Nights,' and were doubtless incorporated at various times and from various sources; their omission sets the reader more free to enjoy the tales themselves, while their inclusion constantly interrupts him. Many of them are of a most scurrilous description, and could not (as Captain Burton admits) be included in a decent edition; others are downright stupid. The most characteristic of the remainder—those which betray a Persian or Indian origin, together with others taken from the Arabic historians and illustrative of the court of the Khalifs—might advantageously be relegated to a place at the end of the whole work. Adding the omitted anecdotes to the omitted tales, it appears that Lane left out about a third of the whole 'Nights,' and of that third at least three-fourths was incompatible with a popular edition. When Mr. Payne and Captain Burton boast of presenting the public 'with three times as much matter as any other version,' they perhaps mean a third as much again.

The style of Lane's translation is an old-fashioned, somewhat Biblical language, which, in spite of a certain stiffness and a too general use of Latin as opposed to Saxon derivatives, seems to us well adapted to the purpose. Captain Burton indeed criticises somewhat severely the 'bald literalness' of Lane's version, which he says was written at a time when 'our prose was perhaps the worst in Europe;' but those who are acquainted with this critic's quaint perversions of the English language may feel surprised when he thus poses as a judge of prose style; and when they read his sweeping condemnation of all English fifty years old, they may be tempted to recall the names of a few writers of that period, when Walter Scott, Hazlitt, and Lamb had but just done writing, and Macaulay and Thackeray were rising to fame, and the name of De Quincey was still potent. But Captain Burton really misunderstands the design of Lane's style, which aimed at reproducing to some degree the literary flavour of the original. The Boulak edition of 1835, which was Lane's text (and also, by the way, is Captain Burton's, though he taxes Lane with adopting an 'abbreviated' text, and professes himself to have followed the Calcutta edition), is not composed in ordinary colloquial Arabic, but in a rather poor imitation of the literary style: to the ordinary Cairene audience it has an antiquated ring, and it

is precisely this antiquated ring that Lane has succeeded in preserving. It may have been a waste of trouble to try to preserve it; but at least it is better than filling a translation of a mediæval Arab story book with a jumble of the vulgarest slang of all nations, which we shall presently see is what Captain Burton has done.

Lane's 'Thousand and One Nights' is, however, something more than a translation. It is a commentary upon Arabian society in the past and present. The translator's long residence in Egypt gave him not only the scholarship to which the Ulama of Cairo had recourse in their nicest legal disputes, but also an intimate acquaintance with Mohammedan life, which enabled him to annotate his version of the 'Arabian Nights' with a wealth of illustration which no other translator has ever approached. He had the good fortune to know Egypt at a time when 'the trail of the' Frank was not yet 'over it all,' when the habits of the people were still what they had been for centuries, and when the corruptions and refinements of Western civilisation had as yet hardly touched the Cairenes. The result of his close observation at this peculiarly happy period was his book on the 'Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians,' and a little later he turned this knowledge to account in the notes to the 'Thousand and One Nights.' The picture of Eastern society there displayed was a priceless addition to the work: only by a study of these notes could the world in which the people of the 'Arabian Nights' moved be adequately understood, and their special value alone was sufficient to give Lane's translation the palm over all others. It has been frequently reprinted, and there is always a demand for it. The notes have also been collected and arranged in a separate volume, with the title of 'Arabian Society in the Middle Ages,' a book which Captain Burton regards as an essential companion volume to all editions of the 'Nights.'

Thus was the second stage of initiation attained. Galland had given us a paraphrase of a fragment of the 'Arabian Nights,' mixed with other tales, to which Von Hammer added an abridged and little known version of the stories not included in the French edition. Then Lane retranslated the 'Nights' in a practical spirit, omitting what was objectionable, together with a few tales that were on the whole uninteresting or tautological, and enriching the work with a multitude of valuable notes. We had now a scholarly version of the greater part of the 'Nights,' imbued with the spirit of the East and rich in illustrative comment;

and for forty years no one thought of anything more, though Galland still kept his hold on the nursery. Nobody desired to see the objectionable passages which constituted the bulk of Lane's omissions restored to their place in the text, and if a fault was found with his version it was not that it was incomplete, but that it was too long. Such considerations satisfied the older generation of critics;—but other times other manners. A mania has now seized upon literary peddlers which incites them to deeds of laborious collation, much fumbling among forgotten papers, and many curious vagaries in typography; and this mania is the anthophobia, or dread of selecting only what is best. The zealous editors and translators of to-day will spare no pains to retrieve every fragment of an author, his invitations to dinner, his feeblest puns, the memoranda of his tailor's bill, or any other scrap of writing from the sacred fingers, and will then religiously print the precious fragments with all luxury of type and margin, and ample introductions, commentary, and excursus. Or it may be a wholly forgotten writer whom they seek to resuscitate, some star of the tenth magnitude whose extinction the world has long borne with contented resignation. But our critic will not suffer this reprehensible indifference to continue; he has lighted upon the lost star by chance, and his industrious researches have been rewarded by the discovery of twenty lines, let us say, of an unpublished epic by the same neglected hand, which at once confers upon the discoverer the right, nay, imposes the duty, of editing the forgotten luminary with due pomp and circumstance. He brings his work out in several volumes, on large paper; he numbers and initials each copy, and takes the utmost credit to himself for reviving the interest of a fraction of the world in a literary gem. The finding of this lost bard brings him more joy than the reading of the ninety and nine poets who needed no reviving: it may be a poor thing, but it is his own. This resuscitation of authors who have long been decently buried by general consent, or of portions of the works of really great authors which have been acknowledged by themselves and by the world to be unworthy of them, is a species of literary dilettanteism that is becoming a positive plague. There are surely enough books in the world as it is, of all shades of merit or demerit, without raking up the rubbish heaps of the past. So burdened are we with print that we are already crying out for 'the hundred best books,' and even this number is regarded as too large by the Master of Balliol. But it is useless to

fight with a passing crotchet, which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the buttermilk's basket: we can only protest and wait till it is out of fashion.

The 'Arabian Nights' has at last been made the idol of the anthrophobists. What more splendid opportunity for a translator imbued with the modern spirit could be found than in this great 'saga book,' a third of which remained locked up in the intricacies of an Oriental tongue, and that third characterised more or less by objectionable qualities which unfortunately only add to the excitement of a new version? Hitherto not one of the translators—Galland, Von Hammer, Torrens, or Lane—had for a moment entertained the idea of reproducing in their editions the coarseness of the original—a coarseness not so revolting as the morbid nastiness of modern French fiction, but still emphatically disgusting. But the time has come when all such prudish delicacy must be cast off. The 'modest Lane,' as Captain Burton styles him, is a being of the past; now we have—well, we have Captain Burton. The first to carry out the idea of translating the 'Nights'—'mother-naked,' to use a word which is very frequent in the new versions, was Mr. John Payne, who had already distinguished himself by a sympathetic rendering of 'the Poems of Master Francis Villon 'of Paris.' The difficulty that Mr. Payne at first encountered, when he determined to set before the public the exact words of the 'Arabian Nights,' was his ignorance of the language in which they were written. Mr. Payne unfortunately did not know Arabic. This, however, was a disability easily removed. With a courage which cannot be too much admired he quietly set to work to learn Arabic, and though he could hardly make himself an Oriental scholar in so short a time, and probably would hastily disclaim any such title, he undoubtedly managed to pick up enough of the language to understand the 'Arabian Nights' with the assistance of the earlier translations of Torrens and Lane. It must be remembered that the stories are written in very easy, straightforward Arabic, in which the chief difficulty consists in the number of indelicate and vulgar words, which are not always to be found in the dictionaries. Mr. Payne, however, has a genius for language, and he contrived to overcome every disadvantage, and duly brought out his complete translation between 1882 and 1884. It was not published, for obvious reasons; the Villon Society issued it privately to subscribers, and only five hundred copies were printed, with an engagement that they should not be reprinted—an undertaking which

did not reckon with Transatlantic piracy. The edition became the rage of collectors, and stray copies were at one time offered at three times the original price. This remarkable success was chiefly due to the attractions offered to investors by a limited subscribed edition, sure to become rare, and to other peculiarities which need not be more fully indicated; but something was due to the unmistakeable merits of the translation. As a piece of English it holds perhaps the highest rank. Mr. Payne is possessed of a singularly robust and masculine prose, which for the present purpose he has intentionally weighted with archaisms and obsolete words, but without greatly injuring its force or brilliancy. Save when he has roamed very far afield in search of an antique term, Mr. Payne's translation makes very enjoyable reading. And the charm of his prose is enhanced by the manner in which he has employed his gift of verse. Lane, when he admitted poetic quotations, rendered them in prose, and the effect was not pleasing. Mr. Payne translates them in verse, and even retains the metre and order of rhymes of the Arabic; and although this almost necessarily involves a certain sacrifice of literalness, and sometimes leads him into extreme liberties with the original, it is impossible not to feel that the translation as a whole gains immensely by the poetry being preserved in metrical form. For instance, where Lane has—

'If I have been faulty in my affection for you, and committed a deed
of shameful nature,
I repent of my offence, and your clemency will extend to the evildoer,
who craveth forgiveness'—

Mr. Payne substitutes—

'If I have sinned in aught that's worthy of reproach.
or if I've made default against the love of you,
Lo, I repent the fault; so let thy clemency
the sinner comprehend, that doth for pardon sue.'

The verse is nothing remarkable, but it preserves the metrical form, and the choice of words is certainly an improvement. A finer specimen of Mr. Payne's translations is the following, where, as in the Arabic, all the second lines of the couplets retain the same rhyme:—

'By the perfume of his eyelids and his slender waist I swear,
by the arrows that he feathers with the witchery of his air,
By his sides so soft and tender and his glances bright and keen,
by the whiteness of his forehead and the blackness of his hair,
By his arched, imperious eyebrows, chasing shadows from my eyes,
with their yeas and noes that hold me 'twixt rejoicing and despair,'

and so on for seven more couplets; or again—

‘I say to my love, whilst the wine cup is here
and the thousand-voiced bird in the coppice sings clear,
“How long this delaying from gladness? Awake!
for life’s but a loan from a day or a year.
So take thou the cup from the loveling’s white hands,
whose languishing lids are as those of a deer,”’ &c. (Vol. ix. p. 2.)

Mr. Payne’s translation is not only a fine piece of English; it is also, save where the exigencies of rhyme compelled a degree of looseness, remarkably literal. A careful collation of the different versions with their originals leads us to the conclusion that Mr. Payne’s translation is little less faithful than Lane’s in those parts that are common to both, and is practically as close a rendering as is desirable. For so recent a student of Arabic the accuracy of the translation is no slight feat, and Mr. Payne must be congratulated on his marked success. But the more we are struck by the many merits of his version, the more profoundly must we regret that it is defaced by passages which render it unfit for general use. Mr. Payne translates everything, and when a sentence is objectionable in Arabic he makes it equally objectionable in English, or rather more so, since to the Arabs a rude freedom of speech is natural, while to us it is not. When the Arabic contains a peculiarly gross simile it is scrupulously reproduced in Mr. Payne’s English, and when an Arabic word is unknown to the literary language, and belongs only to the low vocabulary of the gutter, Mr. Payne laboriously searches out a corresponding term in English ‘Billingsgate,’ and prides himself upon an accurate reproduction of the tone of the original. The result is that his version is alternately offensive and incomprehensible; for half his choice words must be unknown to the majority of readers, who have not made a special study of the shady side of life. It may be urged that it was necessary that the entire work should be minutely rendered for purposes of reference; it is said that we do not appreciate the true spirit of the ‘Thousand and One’ until we see the tales as they really are, in all their noisome detail, and it is argued that only a false modesty regards as objectionable the plain statement of physiological facts with which everyone is acquainted, but, of which by some strange prudery nobody in England talks—or rather used to talk. All this is very specious; but there is an old and trusty saying that ‘evil communications corrupt ‘good manners,’ and it is a well-known fact that the discus-

sion and reading of depraved literature leads infallibly to the depravation of the reader's mind. The less such things are thought and read about the less will they be enacted in real life. Our standard of delicacy may be wholly conventional, but its infraction is not the less dangerous and reprehensible. As for the argument that the 'Arabian Nights' cannot be understood without the coarse details, it is one that could only be advanced by those who have such wares to sell. Their insertion destroys the enjoyment of the cultivated reader, and gives no fresh insight whatever into the character of the tales, except that he finds that Easterns are coarser of speech than he had expected. This remarkable discovery, which is assumed in all the versions, is hardly so valuable an acquisition that a really fine translation like Mr. Payne's should be wasted, and restricted to the few wealthy collectors of proscribed books and what booksellers' catalogues describe as '*facetiae*,' for the sake of so small a gain in literal accuracy. Apart from its prohibitive price, so long as Mr. Payne's translation remains defiled by words, sentences, and whole paragraphs descriptive of coarse and often horribly depraved sensuality, it can never stand beside Lane's, which still remains the standard version of the 'Arabian Nights.'

Mr. Payne's is an admirably written translation of the whole of the 'Nights,' good, bad, and indifferent, wholesome and noisome, without distinction; but it is nothing more: the notes are insignificant, and this is a very serious defect, since the tales are full of points which require elucidation and comment. But another complete translation is now appearing in a surreptitious way, which aims at something more than being a close rendering and lays special stress upon its notes. This is Sir Richard F. Burton's 'Thousand Nights and a Night,' of which five volumes have so far appeared, professedly under the auspices of a certain 'Kama-shastra Society' of Benares; and five more are to come. Captain Burton, to use the title by which he is best known, began his translation long before Mr. Payne, and the two worked independently, unknown each to the other, until Mr. Payne announced the forthcoming issue of his edition. Captain Burton thereupon postponed his own for a year or two, and assisted Mr. Payne so far as to read his proof sheets; and the amiability of the two translators was testified by their each dedicating a volume to the other. So far as the authors are concerned nothing could be more harmonious and delightful; but the public naturally ask, What do we

want with two forbidden versions? To lock up 500 copies of an objectionable work in 500 private libraries or secret cases in public libraries, and then to issue a thousand still more objectionable copies by another and not a better hand, and submit them to the same restricted public at a similarly prohibitive price, seems preposterous.

One would have imagined that one literal translation of the 'Nights' was enough, especially since any such literal rendering must necessarily come into the legal 'Index Expurgatorius' and cannot address a wide audience. Captain Burton's translation, however, differs in several particulars from Mr. Payne's. In the first place it is much less accurate. Captain Burton professes to have begun by using the Cairo text, and then, finding it 'abbreviated,' to have deserted it for the Calcutta text of Sir W. H. Macnaghten, which Mr. Payne also used, and which is really only a revised form of the Cairo text printed from a MS. once belonging to Mr. Salt, the British consul in Egypt, whose connexion with Belzoni's discoveries is well known.* But a careful examination of Captain Burton's translation shows that he has not, as he pretends, corrected it to agree with the Calcutta text, but has made a hotchpotch of various texts, choosing one or another—Cairo, Breslau, Macnaghten, or first Calcutta ('Two Hundred Nights')—according as it presented most of the 'characteristic' detail in which Captain Burton's version is peculiarly strong. On the other hand he sometimes omits passages which he considers tautological, and thereby deprives his version of the merit of completeness.† It is needless to remark that this uncertainty about the text destroys the scholarly value of the translation. It demands an Arabic scholar to tell whether a passage is really a part of the 'Nights' or merely belongs to the translator's reminiscences or sense of the fitness of things in the East. Captain Burton's 'Arabian Nights,' however, has another defect besides this textual inaccuracy.‡ His

* Captain Burton affixes a mark of admiration to the words 'Aegyptian (!) MS.' in Torrens' title. He can hardly intend to ridicule the old-fashioned spelling, so we must conclude that he was ignorant of the history of the MS. from which the four-volume Calcutta edition was printed.

† E.g. vol. v. p. 327.

‡ Captain Burton's version is sometimes rather loose; for example, he renders *siyar*, which means 'doings,' by 'works and words;' *kāna* signifies 'was,' but Captain Burton puts 'he made him.' In his anxiety to call a spade something decidedly worse he translates *mal-*

English is an unreadable compound of archæology and 'slang,' abounding in Americanisms, and full of an affected reaching after obsolete or foreign words and phrases, which may be interesting to the editor of the Philological Society's new English Dictionary, but are extremely annoying to any reader with a feeling for style. 'I have never hesitated,' says the translator, 'to coin a word,' and accordingly he writes 'she snorted and snarked,' leaving it to the reader to discover what he means. He calls a hunchbacked groom 'Gobbo' or 'Quasimodo;' a bottle he names 'cucurbit;' when he wants to say 'named' he writes 'yclept' or 'hight;' for 'message' he puts 'embassage,' for Greece 'Græcia-land,' while we are perpetually harassed in our reading by such expressions as 'he hent in hand,' 'day darkened and night starkened,' 'he documented the date,' 'an fount of life thou drain in greeneth of rose,' 'what land homes thee?' 'teach these eyne on wake to wone,' 'do you (*sic*) dourest for the nonce?' Quaint words and phrases, like 'meiny,' 'nidering,' 'losel,' 'coolth,' 'foined,' 'he farewelled her,' 'singular' combat (for 'single'), 'rede' (for 'advice'), 'glad-deth,' 'goodly gree,' 'they greed for intrigue,' 'kenned,' 'con,' 'aidance,' to quote but one in a hundred, and neglecting the immense vocabulary of coarse terms which he professes (but we think in vain) not to have 'exaggerated,' place Captain Burton's version quite out of the category of English books. Here is a specimen of his verse (where he 'has not bound himself to the metrical bonds of the Arabic') in which, by the way, there is seen another example of the careless manner in which the proofs have been corrected:—

'Get thee provaunt in this world ere thou wend upon thy way;

And know how surely death descends thy life-lot to waylay:

All thy wordly (*sic*) goods are pride and the painfulest repine:

All thy worldly life is vexing of thy soul in vain display:

Say, is not worldly wone like a wanderer's place of rest,

Where at night he "nakhs" his camel and moves off at dawn of day? (Vol. ii. p. 139.)

Captain Burton's delight in straining the language beyond its capabilities finds a wide field when he comes to those passages in the original which are written in rhyming prose. There are many such, and though their jingle has a certain effect in the Arabic (even there doubtfully pleasing) they sound the reverse of melodious in our own tongue. For this

'ouna ('accursed') by 'damned whore.' Where the Arabic has *ras* ('head') he puts 'eyes,' and *kebir* he renders 'very old.'

reason both Lane and Payne decided not to imitate the rhyme. Captain Burton of course could not neglect such an opportunity for display of linguistic flexibility, on the model of 'Peter Parley picked a peck of pickled pepper' and other childish exercises, as is seen in the following example:—

'So saying he bared his sabre and bore down on them, he and his; but the Franks met them with hearts firmer than rock, and wight clashed against wight, and knight dashed upon knight, and hot waxed the fight, and sore was the affright, and nor parley nor cries of quarter helped their plight, and they stinted not to charge and to smite, right hand meeting right, nor to hack and hew with blades bright-white, till day turned to night and gloom oppressed the sight.' (Vol. ii. p. 115.)

This amusement of reproducing the sound of the original may be carried to any length, and we do not see why Captain Burton neglects the metre of the poetry, or divides his translation into sentences by means of stops, or permits any break in the continuity of the narrative, since none such exists in the Arabic. The following example of a literal rendering, which Mr. Payne adduces in order to show the difficulty of turning the phraseology of the original into good English, should have served Captain Burton as a model; and we are surprised he has not adopted so charmingly cumbrous a style:—

'When the morning morrowed he anointed the feet of him with the water the which they two had taken it from the herb and descended to the sea and went walking in it days and nights and he wondering at the horrors of the sea and the marvels of it and the rarities of it and he ceased not going upon the face of the water till he came to an island as indeed it [were] Paradise so Balukiya went up to that island and became wondering at it and at the beauty of it and wandered in it and saw it a great island the dust of it saffron and the gravel of it of cornelian and precious stones and the hedges of it jessamine and the vegetation of it of the goodliest of the trees and the brightest of the sweet-scented herbs and the sweetest of them and in it springs running and the brushwood of it of the Comorin aloes and the Sumatra aloes and the reeds of it sugar-cane and around it the rose and the narcissus and the amaranth and the gilliflower and the camomile and the lily and the violet and all that in it [were] kinds and colours and the birds of it warbled upon those trees and it was fair of attributes spacious of sides' &c. (Vol. ix. p. 381.)

If, however, Captain Burton has not adhered so closely as this to his text, he has done the next best thing possible: he has produced a version which is neither Arabic nor English, but which has at least the merit of being beautifully unreadable. The unfortunate characters of the 'Arabian

'Nights' who have been subjected to his linguistic experiments express themselves in language so peculiar and unnatural that their very words, like their fates, should prove 'a warning to him who would be admonished.'

As a mere translation Captain Burton's is a failure; it is at once too loose and too literal. But his notes, on which he lays peculiar stress, have to be taken into consideration in reckoning up the value of his work. He cites Lane's notes with unqualified approval, and specially recommends the collected form in which they were separately published in 1883, with the title of 'Arabian Society in the Middle Ages,' and gives it as his opinion that 'the student who adds the notes of Lane ("Arabian Society") to mine will know as much of the Moslem East and more than many Europeans who have spent half their lives in Orient lands.' When we examine the notes we can readily believe this curiously expressed statement. Probably no European, even if he have lived half a century 'in Orient lands,' has ever gathered together such an appalling collection of degrading customs and statistics of vice as is contained in the notes to Captain Burton's translation of the 'Arabian Nights.' It is bad enough in the text of the tales to find that Captain Burton is not content with plainly calling a spade a spade, but will have it styled a dirty shovel; but in his notes he goes far beyond this, and the varied collection of abominations which he brings forward with such gusto is a disgrace and a shame to printed literature. In his preface, which is curiously egotistical and amusingly contemptuous of successive governments for not recognising 'superiority' and for giving 'the prizes of the competitive services to certain pets of the *médiocratie*,' he states that 'these volumes afford me a long-sought opportunity of noticing practices and customs which interest all mankind and which "society" will not hear mentioned' (xviii). Here we have the keynote of Captain Burton's commentary. Beyond accumulating the worst abominations of Eastern vice, and illustrating them by corresponding monstrosities in Europe, he has added very little of real importance to the notes of Lane. Here and there we find a useful explanation, derived from the translator's long experience of Oriental life; but this is the exception. A large proportion of the notes consists of such fatuous ejaculations as, 'Poor human nature! How sad to compare its pretensions with its actualities!' or, 'Hypocrisy being the homage vice pays to virtue: a

of general
note.

‘homage, I may observe, nowhere rendered more fulsomely than among the so-called Anglo-Saxon race;’ ‘Rum (which I write Roum, in order to avoid Jamaica).’ At p. 248 of vol. v. we read how Emanuel Deutsch in his ‘Quarterly’ article on the Talmud ‘had the courage to speak of “our Saviour.”’ The note is curiously irrelevant, and also inaccurate; for it is well known that the Christian allusions in Deutsch’s essay were not in the ‘copy,’ and were excised when the article was reprinted in the volume of his ‘Literary Remains.’ Captain Burton hardly practises the toleration which he ascribes to Deutsch, but writes in a contemptuous tone of all religions, while his experience in the East seems to have obliterated any sentiments of chivalry, for he is never weary of recording disparaging estimates of women, and apparently delights in discovering evidence of ‘feminine devlry.’ Now and again he has an ingenious philological theory to expound, but in historical illustration he is uniformly weak; he mixes up the Khalifs Al-Mustansir and Al-Muntasir, and calls the former the fifty-sixth Abbaside! * while he actually depends upon the respectable but antiquated D’Herbelot for his information. His notions of Arabic palæography also appear to be somewhat vague, and would be considerably improved if he consulted the Oriental facsimiles of the Palæographical Society, where the fiction that Kufic was an older script than Naskhi was refuted long before the discovery of the Hauran inscription.

We have now passed in review the various first-hand translations of the ‘Arabian Nights.’ We have been compelled to do this in some detail, for such extravagant claims have been set up for the two recent ‘complete’ versions that it was necessary to satisfy ourselves how far they really effected the revolution in the character of the ‘Nights’ which they claimed to have made. We have seen that the portions previously omitted are inferior in literary and romantic interest to those previously included, and that most of them are incapable of being translated for general reading; that many of the excised portions are little more than repetitions of others already translated, and that the public loss by such omissions is exceedingly small, while in other regards, especially on the score of cleanness, the gain is considerable. The different versions, however, have each its proper destination—Galland for the nursery, Lane for the library, Payne for the study, and Burton for the sewers. We have

* Vol. i. p. 317.

spoken severely with regard to the last, and also in respect of Mr. Payne's needless literalism, because we can find no adequate justification for flooding the world with an ocean of filth. Mr. Payne has spoilt a fine translation by scrupulously retaining the indelicacy of the original, but he has not aggravated it. Captain Burton, while professing that he has not 'exaggerated the indecencies,' has multiplied them fourfold in text and notes, and has produced a work which no decent gentleman will long permit to stand upon his shelves. We are sorry to be obliged to say this; for it is a great misfortune that Captain Burton's wide and undisputed knowledge of Oriental manners and customs should have been turned to so little account. When he might have really added to our information on the general life and ideas of Mohammedans, he has preferred to constitute himself the chronicler only of their most degraded vices. Lane remarks that many passages in the 'Arabian Nights' seem to have been introduced merely to amuse the rabble that hang about a low coffee house, for they contain expressions and record practices to which people in the ranks and positions of the characters described in the tales could never have descended. It is to be regretted that Captain Burton has seized principally upon these elements and has addressed himself to a similar audience.

Nearly two centuries of familiarity with the 'Arabian Nights' and a dozen translators and editors have done but little towards elucidating the history of the work. There is nothing surprising in this, for it is always difficult to trace the beginnings of popular tales, and the difficulty is naturally increased when the scene of their oral narration is not much frequented by competent observers and the language in which they are told is unfamiliar to the majority of travellers. The greatest assistance may often be derived from the study of the tales still surviving in the mouth of the people; but unfortunately such study has been carried out to a very limited extent in regard to the countries where the tales of the 'Arabian Nights,' or others derived from the same ancient source, might be expected to survive. Eastern travellers have been neither numerous nor, as a rule, well equipped, and it needs a considerable command over an Oriental language, and a rare familiarity with the people, to enable a European to collect the oral folklore of Persia or Syria. Until a collection of the stories still floating orally among the peoples of the Mohammedan East has been made it is impossible to form a final judgement upon the vexed

question of the sources of the 'Nights.' In the absence of such aid we are compelled to fall back upon the internal evidence of the tales themselves, and upon the two or three references in the Arabic historians bearing upon the subject. Much as modern specialists are apt to look down upon the more general learning of their predecessors, the credit of discovering the chief passages in Arabic literature relating to the 'Arabian Nights' belongs to the brilliant and laborious Von Hammer, to whom, with De Sacy and Sir William Jones, is due the creation and stimulation of the first ardour for Eastern studies in Europe. Von Hammer discovered in Mas'udi's historical work, the 'Meadows of Gold' (A.D. 944), a passage in which the framing story of the 'Arabian Nights'—the jealous Sultan, who killed a new wife every morning till he was cajoled into postponing the fate of the last of them for the sake of her storytelling—is indicated, with even the names of the two sisters, Shirzad and Dinazad, closely resembling those in the 'Arabian Nights.' Mas'udi is referring to the wonderful legend of 'Many-columned Irem,' which was current at the time of Mu'awiya, the Omniade Khalif, in the seventh century, and is comprised in the 'Arabian Nights,' and he says that stories like this are considered by many of the learned to be

'contemptible lying fabrications invented by raconteurs at the courts of the kings, who put it into the heads of the people of their time to preserve and repeat them. Their method is like that of the books which have come down to us and been translated for us from the Persian and Indian [or "Pehlevi" in another MS.] and the Greek . . . like the book *Hezar Afsaneh*, which means in Arabic "The Thousand Tales," but the people also call it "The Thousand Nights" ["and a Night" in some MSS.]—it is the narrative of the King and the Vizir and his daughter and her sister, whose names are Shirzad and Dinazad;—and like the "Book of Firza [Wird] and Simas," and what it contains about the Kings of India and their Vizirs; and like the "Book of Sindibad" and other books of the sort.'*

Hamza of Ispahan, writing in 961, says that in the time of the Ashkanian Kings of Persia 'books were composed which 'are still in men's hands, such as the "Book of Marouk," 'and the "Book of Sindibad," and the "Book of Barsanas,"

* Maçoudi, 'Les Prairies d'Or,' ed. C. Barbier de Meynard, vol. iv. pp. 89, 90. Besides 'Many-columned Irem,' the 'Hezar Afsaneh,' 'Book of Sindibad,' and 'Story of Wird Khan and Shimas,' Mas'udi was evidently acquainted with the story of the 'City of Brass,' for he tells how the Amir Musa visited this remarkable city in Morocco on his way to Spain' (ibid. vol. i. p. 369).

‘and the “Book of Shimas,” and the like books, in number ‘nearly seventy.’*’

Von Hammer did not adduce Hamza’s evidence, but he quoted the even more weighty testimony of the Fihrist of En-Nedim, written in 987:—

‘The first who composed fanciful tales and made books of them . . . were the Persians. Then the Ashkanian kings . . . added to them. Then these tales were amplified and augmented in the days of the Sassanian kings. The Arabs also translated them into the Arabic language, and the eloquent and fluent took them and trimmed and embellished them, and *composed others like them*. The first book of this kind that was made is the book *Hezar Afsan*, which signifies “The “Thousand Tales.”’

En-Nedim then describes in detail the framing story of the ‘Arabian Nights,’ the suspicious king and Shehrazad, and adds that though it comprised a thousand nights there were less than two hundred night stories, since one story lasted several nights. The ‘Hezar Afsan,’ he says, was attributed to Queen Humay, daughter of Bahman. ‘I have ‘seen it complete several times, and it is indeed a corrupt ‘book of silly narratives.’† The sedate sheykh and man of learning in the East has always entertained a hearty contempt for such tales, which he considers are only fit for the coffee houses and the rabble, and this disparaging estimate among the learned may account for the fact that the passages just quoted, with a bare mention of the ‘Thousand ‘Nights’ (or in some MSS. ‘Thousand and One’—probably a gloss of the copyist), quoted by El-Makrizi and others,‡ are the only references to any similar collection of tales in Arabic literature. They are, however, of the first importance. They prove beyond a doubt that the general plan or framework of the ‘Nights’ was derived from a Persian story book called the ‘Hezar Afsaneh,’ which was already considered an ancient work in the middle of the tenth century; and the two stories mentioned by Mas’udi, ‘Wird ‘Khan or Jilkand and Shimas’ and the ‘Book of Sindibad’ (not to be confounded with ‘Sindibad of the Sea’), which were apparently separate works, and not portions of the ‘Hezar Afsaneh,’ are contained in the ‘Arabian Nights,’ under the titles of ‘Jeliyad and Wird Khan and Shimas’

* ‘Hamzae Ispahanensis Annales,’ ed. Gottwaldt, Arab. text, pp. 41-2.

† Lane, ‘Thousand and One Nights,’ vol. iii. review.

‡ Khitat, vol. ii. p. 485.

and 'The King and his Son, and the Damsel, and the 'Seven Vizirs.' In the tenth century, then, we find an old Persian story book, with the same plan as the 'Arabian 'Nights,' already translated into Arabic (and, to judge from En-Nedim's way of mentioning it, not recently so translated), and two other tales identical with two still comprised in the 'Arabian Nights;' but here our information abruptly ends. Are we to suppose that the 'Arabian Nights' is merely a translation of the 'Hezar Afsaneh' and other old Persian collections? If not, how far do the two agree? Whence were the added portions, if any, derived, and at what time did the collection take its present form? For these and similar questions we have nothing but the internal evidence of the stories themselves to go upon, except one other historical datum—a note in the margin of the Syrian MS. of part of the 'Nights' belonging to Galland, where a reader at Tripoli in Syria gives the date of his perusal as A.H. 955, or A.D. 1548. From the time of Mas'udi in the tenth century to 1548, therefore, our sole guide as to the date and developement of the collection must be the tales themselves.

In examining the internal evidence it is well to distinguish clearly between two sources of information: one is the general picture of manners and customs, social and political relations, and the like; the other consists in individual references to events, persons, places, and articles of consumption, which are supposed to supply fixed chronological points. They must be distinguished for this reason: that while it was impossible so to recast the 'Nights' that the conditions of society should belong to a different age or religion, it was easy for copyists to insert words and names that belonged to their own time but did not exist at the date of the composition of the tales. We hold that the mention of such things as coffee and tobacco, or of certain places or streets in Cairo, and the like, easily interpolated by copyists, furnishes but uncertain testimony to the age of the stories in which such references occur. Here we are at variance with both Lane and Mr. Payne, who seek to deduce conclusions from stray references of this kind; but we are unable to perceive the historical value of such evidence. The only incidental occurrence of a name to which we should attach much significance as a witness to the date of the story would be such a one as, from obsolescence, could not with any probability have been inserted at a later date; and we shall have occasion further on to refer

to one such example which may present some interest. The general character of social life presented by the tales is, on the other hand, a safe guide, and this must be the chief witness as to date. The highest authority on this point is the late Mr. Lane, who states his unqualified conviction that the tales represent the social life of mediæval Egypt, and he selects a period approaching the close of the fifteenth century as the probable date of collection, though some of the tales are, he believes, rather later. There is not the slightest doubt that the life portrayed in the 'Nights' is Moham-medan, and many circumstances, such as peculiarities in the language, the minuteness with which Cairo and no other city is described, and certain other characteristics, point clearly enough to the Egyptian capital as the place where the tales were composed or redacted. Since the 'Hezar Afsaneh' and the other Persian books appear from Mas'udi, Hamza, and En-Nedim to have been written long before Moham-medanism existed, it is clear that the first question we asked above is answered: the 'Book of the Thousand and One 'Nights' is not a mere translation of the old Persian story books, since the life is Moslem and not Magian. Apart from 'Jeliyad' and 'The King and his Vizirs,' both of which are Indian stories, very few of the tales of the 'Nights' can with any probability be ascribed to a Persian or Indo-Persian source. Many of them, indeed, have their scene laid in Persia, and give Persian names to their characters, and may therefore have been indebted to the Persian archetype for something of their outline, but their details are purely Moslem. 'The Queen of the Serpents,' with its subordinate tales, is probably Persian, and may have been derived from the 'Hezar Afsaneh'; and 'Seyf-el-Mulouk' is known to have existed independently in Persia in the eleventh century. Two other stories, 'Kamar-ez-Zeman' and the 'Magic 'Horse,' seem to have been taken from a common (and presumably Persian) source with 'Peter of Provence' and 'Cleomades and Claremond,' inasmuch as the Eastern and Western romances are obviously identical, yet present such minor differences as could hardly have arisen had either been derived from the other. The 'Voyages of Sindibad' includes passages taken from a large number of books of travels, such as those of Idrisi, Kazwini, and Ibn al Wardi, and may perhaps represent some early Persian journeys in the far East and Ceylon, or even trace its descent from the 'Shipwrecked Mariner,' an ancient Egyptian story of the XIIth Dynasty (circ. 2500 B.C.), which is preserved on

a papyrus at St. Petersburg, and of which the 'Odyssey,' as well as 'Sindibad,' may be a descendant.

All these are, however, exceptions: the great mass of the tales related in the 'Arabian Nights' are Moslem and Egyptian. In the absence of the evidence which would be afforded by an ancient manuscript, it appears to us that any speculations as to the precise date of the collection must be more or less precarious. The tales are probably of various ages. Some, such as the anecdotes of the early Khalifs, are doubtless almost contemporary with the persons whose adventures they relate; others, like those which chronicle ordinary Moslem life, with Haroun-er-Rashid as a princely providence, may have been added from time to time, but at what particular period there is little evidence to show; some, like 'Abu-sh-Shamát' and 'Ali of Cairo,' are probably as late even as the Turkish conquest of Egypt. Moslem manners and customs change so little, or at least did change so little before Europeans invaded the East, that it is not safe to fix upon any special century as indicated by the life of the characters. One starting point may, however, be ascertained: the tales could hardly have been composed in Egypt so early as the time of the Fatimite Khalifs, for these rulers were of the heretical sect of the Shi'ites, whilst the 'Nights' are persistently Sunnite; and it would have been impossible to harmonise Shi'ite stories, even if they were not officially proscribed, with the theology of the orthodox party. The Fatimite empire came to an end in the latter part of the twelfth century, when Saladin occupied Egypt. It is remarkable that Saladin is the latest historical personage mentioned in the 'Nights,' and this adds additional probability to the belief that the collection of these stories (though not necessarily their original composition) formed part of that general revival of letters, arts, and refinements of all kinds which accompanied the irruption of Kurdish and Tartar rulers into Egypt and which terminated with the Ottoman conquest—a golden age which occupied the whole of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. There can be very little doubt that during this period the 'Arabian Nights' by degrees assumed essentially their present shape. It is not necessary to suppose that the tales were all simultaneously incorporated; for a night may be long or short, and the division offers every facility for expansion. Mr. Payne has distinguished what he calls the 'original work,' consisting of a dozen tales, corresponding roughly to Lane's first volume (or a fifth of the whole), and believes that this formed the

nucleus to which other tales were gradually added up to the sixteenth century. The ground for this view is chiefly that all these 'original' stories have a certain general character in common, and appear in the same order in all the texts and MSS., while the later tales vary both in number and position and show signs of miscellaneous sources. It does not necessarily follow that even this 'original work' was put together all at once, but it may probably have been the first general collection of the 'Nights.' Mr. Payne ascribes this nucleus to the thirteenth century, on the strength of the Barber's horoscope in the story of the 'Hunchback,' where the year is given as A.H. 653 (A.D. 1255). This date may of course be the insertion of a copyist, but it agrees well enough with the Barber's statement that he was in Baghdad during the reign of the Khalif El-Mustansir (not 'Muntasir,' as in some versions), A.D. 1226-1242. At the same time there are so many inconsistencies in the 'Nights' that it is rash to lay too much stress upon an occasional consistency. The Christian broker in the Hunchback's story refers to the Khan of El-Jawaly, which was a fourteenth-century building, and some MSS. instead of 653 give 763 for the Barber's horoscope. Both these dates may be merely the interpolations of copyists, as may also the mention of the Khan, but we are inclined to think there is something in them.

Another curious reference, which has not so far been noticed, is the name of the 'Darb el-Munakkiri,' mentioned in the same story. There is no such street in Makrizi's minute 'Topography of Cairo,' but there is a Darb el-Munkadi or Munkadhi, which, as scholars know, would be written with letters easily mistaken for 'Munakkiri.' Makrizi tells us that the Darb el-Munkadhi was no longer so called in his time (about 1430), but was known as the Darb el-Amir Bektemir el-Ustaddar.* There were two high officials named Bektemir, and both died in the first half of the fourteenth century. We have, therefore, this interesting fact: that the name given to this street in the 'Arabian Nights' was obsolete in the early part of the fifteenth century, and was exchanged for a name which was presumably given it soon after the death of the eponymous Amir Bektemir—say, about the middle of the fourteenth century. The Khan of El-Jawaly, mentioned in the same story, was built about 1320, and its mention would therefore tally fairly well with that of a street which lost

* Khitat, vol. ii. p. 40.

its name of Darb el-Munkadhi about 1350. It is true that the street in question is not in the direction of the Hebbaniya, to which the hero was going; but the Hebbaniya itself may be a copyist's alteration. Lane mentions a various reading 'Jabbaniya,' and the street Jabbasa might be another. If there had been a 'Darb el-Munakkiri' we may be sure Makrizi would have mentioned it: the reading 'Darb 'el-Munkadhi,' therefore, seems inevitable, and if it be correct we have a name which no copyist would have interpolated after about the middle of the fourteenth century. This fresh discovery does not furnish us with the date of the story, but it gives us the date of one of its redactions, and shows it must have existed in the middle of the fourteenth century; the Barber's date, 653, probably points to an earlier redaction. We are disposed to think that the original composition of the stories must be placed a good deal earlier than either of these; for no name of a ruler, as we have said, occurs later than Saladin, and we can hardly believe that a series of stories, written for the first time under the dominion of the Mamluks, would have entirely ignored the titles and offices of the Mamluk court or the military system carried to such perfection by these famous Sultans. Most of the stories were probably brought down by generations of public reciters from the days of the early Khalifate, and, as they were orally preserved, they were doubtless swollen by continual accretions; but they probably did not take the collected form of the 'Thousand and One Nights' till the thirteenth century, or even later.

It was Lane who first brought out the importance of the 'Arabian Nights' as constituting a picture of Moslem life and manners. They had previously been treated merely as romantic fictions, and in the present day those who have been educated upon the English versions after Galland would probably say that the tales consisted mainly of impossible adventures with genies and afrits, and suchlike supernatural elements. The narratives are of course primarily romances and fictions, but they are also records of the life of the people, as accurate and detailed as many an historical work, and the part played in them by genies and other supernatural beings is insignificant except in those tales which appear to be of Persian origin. In the first story the genie imprisoned in the bottle merely supplies a frame or groundwork for the tales of the three sheykhs; the real supernatural element which is here predominant is enchantment. Again, the next story, the 'Fisherman and the Genie,' would soon come

to an end if the doings of the afrit were its main subject. As soon as the genie has heard the history of the Sage Douban (through the sides of the bottle in which he is confined by the seal of Solomon the Great), he induces the fisher to let him out, and having rewarded him with the secret of the magic fish, the monster disappears for ever from the story, which at once proceeds to the favourite topic of the 'original work,' enchantment, as exhibited in the misfortunes of the 'Young King of the Black Islands,' or 'Ensorcelled Youth,' as Torrens and Burton call him. No genie takes part in the third story, that of the 'Porter and the Ladies of Bagdad,' but enchantment is a constant motive; and another very favourite theme of the 'Nights,' and also of sober historians, a deserted or petrified city, suggested probably by such ruins as a Bedawi would encounter in the desert, at Petra and elsewhere, is twice introduced. In the fourth tale, the genies only come in as carriers, to transport Hasan Bedred-din to and from Sitt-el-Husn; and in the group of tales framed by the story of the 'Hunchback' there is no supernatural element, any more than in the sixth and seventh tales, 'Nour-ed-din and Inis-el-Jalis' and 'Ghalib the Dis-traught Thrall of Love.' It is only when we have passed the portion which Mr. Payne has styled the 'original work' that the world of spirits begins to hold a prominent position in the 'Nights,' as we find it in 'Kamar-*ez-Zeman*,' 'Seyf-el-Mulouk,' 'Hasan of Basra,' and other tales which have a Persian character.

Supernatural beings really hold quite a subordinate place in the 'Arabian Nights;' the true and universal theme is love. Enchantment, genies, petrified cities, the philosopher's stone, even the adventures of the restless Khalif Haroun—who was in the habit of relieving his insomnia by prowling about Baghdad of a night and diverting himself with the adventures of his subjects, and thus forming a serviceable frame to the canvas—'all are but ministers of love,' absolutely subordinate to the great theme. The Khalif enters upon the stage only to play Prince Florizel and bless the happy couple; hideous afrits or beauteous but huge jinniyas appear, but only to carry in their mighty arms the sleeping prince or princess to the presence of the beloved; cities lie deserted, indeed, because of their idolatry, but there is usually a survivor at whose beauty somebody immediately becomes unconscious of his or her own existence; people are victims of the Black Art, but the reason is that they interfere with the love of a jealous or unfaithful woman.

The characteristic theme of the 'Nights' is love, and it appears in every form and variety. Most commonly it is the violent passion inspired by a first glimpse of the beloved, as she waters her flowers at the lattice window and displays but the turn of her wrist; or as she sits on the seat in the merchant's shop and shows him the fire of her eyes with their dark fringe of kohl, and allures him with the honey of her tongue. The 'Nights' are largely made up of such chance meetings and the instantaneous kindling of a frantic passion, which sticks at nothing to accomplish its desire. The ladies return the emotion with at least equal enthusiasm; and it is generally they who, through the intermedium of some old woman, arrange the interview for which both are longing. Many of the tales are founded upon a palace intrigue, when one of the Khalif's women contrives to admit her lover into the forbidden precincts of the royal harim, and therefrom ensue various and exciting adventures, and much fainting, weeping, and broken hearts. Such is the tale of 'Ali the Son of Bakkar and Shems-en-Nahar,' where the lover is altogether too lachrymose for Western taste. Another is the story of 'Ghalib the Son of Ayyub,' where the Lady Zobeyda, the Khalif's jealous wife (she had her reasons), makes the hero a scapegoat for her hatred of Kout el-Kuloub; but all ends well, and the Khalif blesses Ghalib and the fair slave. 'Khalifa the Fisher' has the same motive. But others are much more romantic, and some have a very pathetic side, like the melancholy tale of the unselfish devotion of Aziza to her cousin Aziz, a weak-kneed and sentimental youth, or the charming little love story of the Christian broker, or 'Ali Sher and Zumurrud,' or 'Gulnar of the Sea,' where we have the one Undine of the 'Nights,' but without the tragedy.

The charm of these love stories lies, we believe, chiefly in their absolute *abandon*. The lovers love, and that is enough; no power on earth can keep them long apart—or if it can, they die. The hero journeys over the whole world in search of the object of his love. He has seen her for but a moment and knows not who she is; but he has fallen in love, and off he sets, be he king's son or plain merchant. Of course he finds her, and then the narrator has to separate them, when the lady will probably be carried off by genies or robbers or wicked Magians, or will stray to an unknown country, where she will assume male attire and become vizir of the land, until such time as her lost love chances to come that way, when they will embrace each other till they swoon, and then

pass their lives in ecstasy till they are 'visited by the Terminator of Delights and the Separator of Companions.' There is no lack of the true romantic spirit about these tales, which form the bulk of the 'Arabian Nights.' That nothing is impossible to him who loves is their teaching, provided—and this is a conspicuous moral in the tales—provided he be not cursed with a spirit of curiosity, in which case he is in danger of losing his head or being carried back from the palace of houris to his own dull shop on the giddy back of a flying horse. 'Ask not of that which doth not concern thee, lest thou hear what will not please thee,' is the lesson of many a tale, and Bluebeard's secret chamber has its numerous equivalents in the 'Nights.' It is only when he cannot bring his lovers together, or having done so cannot find enough fires of trouble to test their constancy, that the Arab *raconteur* introduces his genie, 'afrit,' or 'marid,' or changes his hero into an ape. As a rule he finds he has quite enough to do to manage his inflammable lovers without trespassing too far in the direction of the Mountains of Kaf, where the genies habitually reside.

Yet these romantic lovers, who will go through fire to meet each other, are not in themselves interesting characters. It may be questioned whether they have any character at all. Beauty they both possess, and that is the sole reason for their mutual attachment. The young man is described in terms which we should apply only to girls; the softness of his skin, the turn of his waist (conceive an Englishman with a waist!), or the curve of his cheek are made the subject of ecstatic admiration by his lady love, who constantly faints at the mere sight of his charms. We do not hear that he was brave, though he was generally able to support pain with fortitude; we do not read that he was a mighty hunter, or fond of polo or of any manly exercises—a fact which points conclusively to a middle-class *bourgeois* origin for the tales. Our young lover is something of a 'mollycoddle,' though he is capable of great exertions when it is a question of seeking out his princess in the islands of Wak-Wak or elsewhere. Even then, however, he does not seem to be doing it quite of his own accord. He saunters out of the city with a vague intention of finding the lost beauty, but it depends on higher powers whether he succeed. At every point some providential interposition, in the form of a chance encounter or a complaisant genie or the like, is necessary to move him another stage onwards in his journey; and we are left to infer that but for this *deus ex machina* the

young man would probably have sat down and contentedly wept. Nor is the young lady much more individual; she is of course lovely, with a form like the Oriental willow and a vacillating gait; she can probably produce from her pocket a lute in a hundred and thirty-two pieces, which she will put together and then discourse most eloquent music; she may possess the gift of oratory, and even be profoundly trained in all branches of learning, though this is very exceptional. But of her other qualities, less external than beauty and accomplishments, we hear nothing, unless it be the very general capacity for ingenious intrigue and the power of 'finding a way,' which in Eastern love is almost always managed by the woman. The other characters are also little better than lay figures: the old king, given to hunting and manly sports, who has no offspring till just when the story begins, and complaisantly gives up his last breath at the very moment when his son is ready to ascend the throne; the wise and venerable vizir and his crafty rival; the old 'kahramana' or go-between; the fair slave girls and the slobbering blacks—all serve to fill the picture of Moslem life, but none has much personal individuality. All are machines appropriately moved by Fate to perform their parts in the remarkable adventures which are forthwith unfolded. The story and not the delineation of character is the essence of the 'Arabian Nights;' and we are not sure that this is much to be regretted. Some of us are still frivolous enough to love 'Montecristo' and the 'Trois 'Mousquetaires,' despite the lack of portraiture; the same ignorant people will maintain, and we shall not contradict them, that Scott's novels are an inexhaustible fund of enjoyment, though there too the story is paramount and the characters a little wooden; and we are afraid there still remain not a few barbarous folk who will like their 'Arabian Nights,' as they like their 'Montecristo' and their 'Ivanhoe,' not the less because there is not much introspection or philosophising in them. Delineation of character is very well in its right place; but we can conceive its being a foreign element in a story book pure and simple, and we confess we do not much miss it in the 'Thousand and One Nights.'

Two or three figures there are, indeed, which stand out conspicuously from the rest and have a character of their own. One is of course the Khalif Haroun er-Rashid, who appears to much greater advantage in the 'Nights' than he ever did in real life. He forms a most imposing and at the same time fascinating figure. He is at once so great and power-

ful and withal so genial and companionable, so ready to take a joke at his own expense, quick of temper, but also quickly appeased, and much given to rolling over backwards with inextinguishable laughter. Haroun, as he walks through the silent streets of Baghdad at night, followed by Jaafar and black Masrour, is a personage whom we could not possibly mistake if we had the good fortune to meet him; and he lends a peculiar and delicious bouquet to every story in which he appears.

Another individual character, whom one would immediately recognise if he came round the corner, is the immortal Barber. The scene in which he makes the young man lose his appointment with the Kadi's daughter is worthy of Molière. It is arranged that the stolen interview shall take place while the good Kadi is engaged in the Friday prayers at the mosque. The young man has dressed himself too early, as lovers will, and he bethinks himself of having his head shaved to pass the time. The Barber is brought, and begins by quoting various pious traditions on the excellence of Friday as a day for the operation of shaving, when the youth, who is on tenter-hooks, cuts him short and tells him to begin immediately.

'And he arose, and stretching forth his hand took out a handkerchief and opened it; and lo, there was in it an astrolabe, consisting of seven plates. And he took it and went into the middle of the court, where he raised his head to the sun and looked for a considerable time; after which he said to me, "Know that there have passed of this our day, which is Friday, and which is the 10th of Safar of the year 653 of the Flight of the Prophet—upon whom be the most excellent of blessings and peace!—and the ascendant star of which, according to the required rules of the science of computation, is the planet Mars—seven degrees and six minutes; and it happeneth that Mercury hath come into conjunction with that planet, and this indicateth that the shaving of hair is now a most excellent operation; and it hath indicated to me also that thou desirest to confer a benefit upon a person; and fortunate is he!—but after that there is an announcement that presenteth itself to me respecting a matter which I will not mention to thee." "By Allah!" I exclaimed, "thou hast wearied me and dissipated my mind, and augured against me, when I only required thee to shave my head. Arise, then, and shave it, and prolong not thy discourse." He replied, "By Allah, if thou knewest the truth of the case, thou wouldst demand of me a further explanation . . . and I counsel thee to do to-day as I direct thee; for I am one who giveth thee good advice. . . ." When I heard this I said, "Verily thou art killing me this day, and there is no escape for me." "O my master," he replied, "I am he whom the people call The Silent, on account of the paucity of my speech, by which I am distinguished above my brothers, for——"

and here the good man goes off into an enumeration of his brothers, ending

“and the seventh brother is named The Silent, and he is myself.” Now when this Barber thus overwhelmed me with his talk, I felt as if my gall-bladder had burst, and said to the boy, “Give him a piece of gold and let him depart, for God’s sake, for I have no need to “shave my head.”

But the Barber is not to be put off, and he forthwith plunges into a long account of how he cupped the youth’s father on a day which his astrolabe showed to be unusually auspicious, and how the father and all the company thanked and rewarded him:—

“May God,” said I, “show no mercy to my father for knowing such a man as thou!” And the Barber laughed, and said, “There is no deity but God! Mohammed is God’s apostle! Extolled be the perfection of Him who changeth others but is not Himself changed! “I did not imagine thee to be other than a man of sense; but thou “hast talked nonsense, because of thine illness.”

And so the worthy man goes on, while the lover gets more and more fidgety and anxious every minute, for the time for his appointment is drawing near:—

‘Then I rent my clothes; and when he saw me do this he took the razor and sharpened it, and continued to do so till my soul almost parted from my body; then advancing to my head, he shaved a small portion, a’ter which he raised his hand and’—quoted several verses of poetry. “‘Thou hast contracted my heart,” I said. . . . “I fancy that “thou art in haste?” said the Barber. “Yes, yes, yes!” I replied. “Proceed slowly,” said he, “for verily haste is from the Devil, and it “giveth occasion for repentance and disappointment, and he (upon “whom be blessing and peace) hath said, ‘The best of affairs is that “‘which is commenced with deliberation,’ and by Allah I am in “doubt as to thy affair. May it be good, for I fear it is otherwise.” . . . And he threw the razor in anger from his hand, and taking the astrolabe, went again to observe the sun. . . . “For God’s sake,” said I, “be silent, for thou hast crumbled my liver.” Thereupon he took the razor and sharpened it as before, and shaved another portion of my head. Then stopping again, he said, “I am in anxiety on account of “thy hurry;”

and so the exasperating Barber goes on ‘till my soul almost “quitted my body.’ Nothing will hurry him; he must see what the young man has for dinner and examine every dish; he must bid all his own friends to the feast, and minutely describe their several peculiarities, while the youth ‘laughed ‘from a heart laden with anger.’ We know how the appointment was missed, how a scene occurred at the Kadi’s house

in which the young man broke his leg, and the indefatigable Barber pursued him through the streets, 'and I desired for 'death to free me from him.' The last touch of all, when the young man again encounters his persecutor, and tells his story as a reason for refusing to remain in the same room, is perfect :—

"By Allah," answered the Barber, "it was through my intelligence that I acted thus towards him; and had I not done so he had perished; myself only was the cause of his escape; and it was through the goodness of God, by my means, that he was afflicted by the breaking of his leg instead of being punished by the loss of his life. Were I a person of many words I had not done him this kindness!"

ART. VII.—*Correspondance du Maréchal Davout, Prince d'Eckmühl, ses Commandements, son Ministère, 1801–1815. Avec Introduction et Notes par CH. DE MAZADE, de l'Académie Française. 4 tom. 8vo. Paris, 1885.*

THE four large volumes lately published of Marshal Davout's official correspondence form what, at first sight, may be thought a disproportionate contribution to the history of events in which this officer occupied only a subordinate position. But the interest in these events shows no sign of diminution; and these volumes furnish, we believe for the first time, an insight into the working of the Napoleonic military system from a new point of view. Hitherto the contributions available to the military history of the time in question have been either in the form of unverified memoirs of different actors in the scene, or the more or less authentic statements of the chief actor. Here we have the official correspondence of the commander of one of the units in the great military machine with which Napoleon effected his achievements. And the record is remarkably continuous. While most of the Generals of the Empire were moved about from one position to another, at one time serving with an army corps directly under the Emperor, at another holding independent command at a distance, Davout remained attached to the same corps—the Third—for almost the whole duration of the reign. Of all Napoleon's lieutenants he was one of the most distinguished; if he never held an absolutely independent command, as others did in Spain and Italy, he fought more than one great battle without support. Moreover, he never lost a battle or position committed to his charge; indeed, it may be said he never

made a serious military blunder, though throughout this long period he was employed without intermission, and always in important positions. These four volumes are therefore not beyond what the interest of the subject deserves. In France they no doubt will be eagerly read; they may be studied with advantage by the soldiers of all nations. It needs hardly to be added that in M. de Mazade, of the French Academy, they have found a highly competent editor.

Born in May 1770, and therefore a year younger than Napoleon, Davout, unlike most of the early generals of the Empire, was of noble birth. His father, who had served for a short time in the army, died when the young Davout was ten years old, leaving him, the eldest of four children, under the care of his mother. He was first sent to a school at Auxerre in his native Burgundy, whence he passed on to the École militaire at Paris, and entered the army in 1789 as a sous-lieutenant in his father's old cavalry regiment, the Royal Champagne. Like so many of the young nobility, he was strongly animated by the revolutionary spirit just rising at that time—so conspicuously, indeed, that in the following year he was arrested and confined for a short period in the Citadel of Arras. On being set free he left the service, whether of his own accord or from dismissal is not stated. In September 1791, when he was little more than twenty-one years of age, he was elected commandant of volunteers of the Yonne, entering that service, which revolutionary fervour had just called into existence, at the same time as Lannes, Soult, Kleber, and many others who afterwards became distinguished generals. He commanded his battalion throughout the campaign of 1792-3 with the Army of the North, a battalion which was among the troops that nearly captured Dumouriez when he rode over to the allies. In 1793, while serving in La Vendée, Davout was nominated General of Brigade and immediately afterwards General of Division, which last promotion he refused; but military institutions partook of the general confusion which attended everything in France at that time, and almost simultaneously with his promotion he came under the decree which expelled all the nobility from the army, and it was only by a fortunate accident he was able to retire quietly to Burgundy. Soon after this his mother was arrested and carried off to Auxerre to be tried by the local Revolutionary Tribunal, leaving in her house a correspondence with the *émigrés*, which, if discovered, would infallibly have procured her condemnation. Young Davout, who had accompanied her on the journey,

managed to escape from their guard during the night, got back home, destroyed the compromising papers, and returned to share his mother's imprisonment, which ended after some months, with that of the many thousands of persons then in prison throughout France, when the Reign of Terror came to an end on the fall of Robespierre in July 1794. A few months later Davout, restored to his rank as General of Brigade, was serving with the army of the Moselle at the blockade of Luxembourg. In the spring of 1795, after the capture of that place, he was transferred to the Army of the Rhine and Moselle, commanded by Pichegru, as a brigadier in Desaix's division. This division later on formed part of the garrison defending Mannheim, and which eventually surrendered to the Austrians. Allowed to return to France on parole, Davout was set free for active service again by an exchange of prisoners, and resuming his position of a brigade commander in Desaix's division, he was engaged in almost all the actions of the Army of the Rhine throughout the important campaigns of 1796-7, which were brought to a conclusion by the peace of Campo Formio. Though still a young man, he was now an old soldier, a Republican at that time in spirit; Republicanism had carried him from sub-lieutenant to general. But he had suffered enough to be disgusted by Republican excesses, and he was already distinguished in the army for the sobriety and sternness of his disposition, and for the habits of discipline which he maintained throughout his career.

Up to this time Davout had never met with Napoleon, now by his Italian victories become the most prominent man in France. He was first introduced to him in March 1798 at Paris by Desaix. A short interview, says M. de Mazade, sufficed to determine the relations between the two men; from that time Davout became one of the band who attached themselves to Napoleon's fortunes. He was at once selected for employment with the Army of Egypt, and went out, again as one of Desaix's brigadiers, with the expedition which sailed in May of that year. Both he and Desaix were left in that country when Napoleon returned to France in 1799, but they followed him soon afterwards under a conditional authority which he had given them, receiving just at the time of embarkation the news of the revolution of the 18th Brumaire, when Napoleon seized on the Government and virtually put an end to the Republic. To this revolution most of the generals gave their adherence—some grudgingly, others with unqualified zeal. Davout was among the latter; he had

come under the influence of Napoleon's power of fascination, and appears to have formed a real personal attachment for him which he never ceased to feel, and henceforth was one of the foremost and most faithful of his lieutenants. He was about this time promoted to be a General of Division, and appointed to the command of the cavalry of the Army of Italy, but was soon recalled to Paris to the command of the Consular Guard, and so did not take part in the Marengo campaign. Napoleon now managed to attach him still more to his fortunes by arranging a marriage for him with M^{lle}. Aimée Leclerc, sister to the general of that name, the husband of Pauline Bonaparte who died soon after at San Domingo. The young lady was one of the pupils at M^{me}. Campan's famous school with Caroline and Pauline Bonaparte, and Davout thus became connected with the First Consul's family. When, in the spring of 1803, on the rupture of the peace of Amiens, what is now generally known by us as the camp at Boulogne—in reality a chain of camps along the north coast of France and Belgium—was established, Davout was named one of four chief commanders, Soult, Ney, and Marmont being the other three. Davout's camp, the headquarters of which were at Bruges, comprised three infantry divisions under Generals Friant, Gudin, and Morand. This force ultimately became the Third Corps of the Grand Army, and it is interesting to note that, notwithstanding the constant changes and movements which took place in the French army, these three generals remained in command of the three divisions of that corps until removed by death or wounds in the Russian campaign of 1812. Nothing in the military experience of our country has ever resembled an organisation of this sort, which was in fact an army kept together as a single regiment might be, maintained intact for so many years, and employed in a succession of gigantic wars in so many different countries. Stern soldier as Davout was, the correspondence shows him to have been on friendly, if not indeed affectionate, terms with his divisional generals; their attachment to him is sufficiently proved by their continuing to serve under him for so many years, when transfer to other positions might have been easily obtained.

The work at the camp was more maritime than military, consisting mainly in efforts to improve the shallow harbours on the coast, to teach the men rowing, and generally in the handling of the small vessels composing the flotilla with which the invasion of England was to be effected. There was plenty of occupation for the troops in this way, and the

construction of huts, roads, and so forth for the camp, but not, it would seem, much practice in field manœuvring—a view confirmed by the interesting memoirs of the Duc de Fézensac, aide-de-camp to Ney at this time, which were reviewed a few years ago in this Journal. Davout's official correspondence is mainly concerned with the movement of the boats for concentration from one point to another, and the measures taken for the health and shelter of the troops; an occasional skirmish is reported with the vessels of the English squadron. That the invasion of England would take place was evidently believed by the general and his troops; but there is nothing to show that Davout was ever consulted by Napoleon about the larger operations involved in the plan, or what he thought of the prospects of success.

In April 1804, when the question of establishing the Empire was in agitation, Davout, on behalf of the troops in his camp, calls upon the Citoyen Premier Consul to make the office hereditary in his family, and suggests that he should take the title of Empereur des Gaules. When the Empire was established in the succeeding month, Davout, with thirteen others, was created a marshal, he being third on the list. Henceforth in the official correspondence with army headquarters the title of 'M. le Maréchal' replaces that of 'Citoyen-General;' 'Mon Général,' as the First Consul was styled when addressed direct, is now 'Sire' and 'Votre Majesté Impériale;' the Emperor in replying addresses him as 'Mon Cousin.'

If the troops in the great camp had not much practice in field manœuvring, this camp life, which lasted for more than two years, must have formed an admirable school for perfecting the practical administration of a large army in all its details, and rendered the famous march to Germany which, with a less organised force of that strength, would have presented a scene of extreme confusion, the comparatively simple and effective operation it proved to be. Davout's reports from day to day to army headquarters show what a splendid effort it was. His corps, he says, used to march all day and part of each night, covering on each march from fifteen to twenty-five miles, a great distance for such a large body of men to accomplish, moving as they generally did in one long column over the same road. There was a difficulty about the carriage of food from the first, but every man had three pairs of shoes, in keeping which articles in good order lay the secret of success. Nevertheless, the subsequent march of the Third Corps from

Vienna to Austerlitz was made under such pressure, to enable it to arrive in time for the battle, that Friant's division left half its numbers footsore behind, the laggards not rejoining till five or six days after the battle. Thus Friant had only about 3,300 men present, of whom 1,400 were killed and wounded; proof of the prominent part taken by the division. Friant himself had four horses shot under him during the day. On this occasion Davout furnishes a long and very interesting report of the specific share taken by his corps in the battle, full of generous praise of deserving officers. His generals did the same in respect of their divisions. Reports of this kind do not appear to have been regularly furnished in subsequent campaigns, possibly because the battles were followed by stress of marching and bivouac that did not admit of report writing; but Davout's methodical habit of reporting to army headquarters under all circumstances, even in the retreat from Moscow, is not a little remarkable, and shows the man's capacity for physical endurance. There can be few things harder to do than at the end of a hard day's fighting and marching to sit down and write a long official letter from a bivouac in the mud or snow.

The Third Corps remained in Germany after the peace with Austria, and in September 1806 Davout got twenty days' leave to go to Paris, but was suddenly ordered back on the outbreak of hostilities with Prussia. The prominent part taken by Davout in the Jena campaign is well known. At the battle of Auerstädt he was opposed with his corps, ill supported by that of Bernadotte, to the main force of the Prussian army, while Napoleon at Jena was engaged with only the smaller part of it. Davout's splendid defence against the attack on his position was made at great loss, Gudin's division alone losing 3,500 men; but the corps took an active part in the subsequent pursuit of the beaten Prussians. Then followed the occupation of North Poland, and the miseries of winter quarters and winter campaigns in that dismal country. The sufferings of his army on that occasion would have deterred anyone but Napoleon from again subjecting them to such difficulties. Whatever he felt about the hardships endured by his corps, Davout makes no complaint; the tone of his reports throughout, which are mainly concerned with the difficulty of supplying the corps, is cheerful and soldierlike. The victorious French army at this time could indeed hardly have been worse off if it had been in retreat instead of advancing. Davout reports from Pultusk, his camp in advance of Warsaw, that his men have no bread

and no wine, nothing but meat and potatoes, and not much of the latter; forage was even more difficult to procure than food for the men. But even these winter quarters were not to be had without fighting for them, for the Russian army, which had now come into the first line to cover the remnant of the Prussian troops, took up such a threatening attitude that Napoleon was constrained to attack them, and in the severe actions which followed, including the battle of Pultusk, fought under all the difficulties of moving over boggy roads and across half-frozen rivers in the last days of December, he conquered, as the editor observes, for a few weeks, but for a few weeks only, the winter quarters his army stood in need of; for the Russians again taking the field towards the end of January 1807, and threatening to turn the positions held by the French, Napoleon gathered up his army from its cantonments and took after his wont the offensive. This short campaign culminated in the bloody and decisive battle of Preussisch-Eylau. In this battle the Third Corps came into action on the second day, when its attack on the left flank of the Russians, combined with that of Ney on their right flank, obliged them to give up the stubbornly contested ground. M. de Mazade puts the Russian loss at 25,000, and that of the French at 10,000 only; but it is impossible to believe that there can have been such a disparity in the numbers, the two armies having fought under equal conditions of ground. Of the wounded, a large proportion must have died from want of shelter and attendance; indeed, in campaigning under such circumstances, when the wounded had to lie out in the snow, conducted without ambulances or hospitals, the wonder is not that men died, but that any were left alive. The waste of life in war under such circumstances, not only amongst the wounded, but amongst the rest of the troops, far exceeds the actual casualties of the battlefield. Campaigning in heat is sufficiently trying, but the ill effect of heat, if it does not actually kill outright, is removed by a draught of water or a cool night; the damage done by bivouacking in mud and snow is more deepseated. The actual losses of the French army in this campaign have never been reported, but they must have been enormous; there was the conscription, however, to make them good, so long as the supply of conscripts was not exhausted.

Although the Russians had yielded up the actual battlefield of Eylau to their opponents, the French could not hold the ground won from want of supplies, but were obliged to fall

back and occupy a line behind the Passarge, and the next few months were spent in refitting and covering the siege of Dantzic. Then came in June the campaign, again begun by the Russians, in view to take the French by surprise, but in which, handled unskilfully, they were outmanœuvred, and finally beaten in the decisive battle of Friedland. Davout's corps was operating on the left flank of the French, and was not engaged in this battle. After the peace of Tilsit, when Napoleon returned to France, Davout was left in command in Poland, with the difficult task of keeping the Poles in hand without unduly discouraging their aspirations after independence, and in superintendence of the training of the Polish levies which afterwards became such an efficient addition to the French army. The Third Corps appears to have been fairly comfortable during this time: the troops were quartered in barracks, and Davout reports that the business of the army was as regularly conducted as if they were quartered in France. An application for leave was refused him on the ground that his services could not be spared, but he was joined at Warsaw by his wife. From Warsaw he was transferred, in August 1808, to Breslau, his command being extended to include Silesia, and comprising altogether, Poles included, 100,000 men. Later on in the year, as a consequence of the Erfurt Conference, the Grand Army was broken up; the troops left in Germany, ostensibly as a temporary arrangement, and cantoned along the left bank of the Elbe, were styled the Army of the Rhine. They comprised five divisions of infantry and four of cavalry, to the command of which Davout, who was now created Duke of Auerstädt, was appointed. He himself asked to be sent to Spain, 'to fight under your Majesty's eyes with our eternal enemies; but, your Majesty having decided otherwise, I shall endeavour to carry out your wishes and to justify your confidence as much as I can.'

It was probably fortunate for Davout's reputation that his application to go to Spain, that grave of reputations for French marshals, was not acceded to. His correspondence now, as before, gives a very full account of the movements of the troops, and the general administration of one of Napoleon's armies in the occupation of a neutral country during peace time. Although in command of 100,000 men, it does not appear that the Marshal had a greater degree of independence as regards the selection of officers for staff appointments, still less as regards regimental promotion, than would a British general holding a

detached brigade. This degree of centralisation was not peculiar to the French army. Wellington in the Peninsula, as we know, had constantly useless officers from home thrust upon him; and, no matter how good an officer with the army might be, he was never selected for promotion on account of merit; the Peninsula generals all got their grade by simple seniority. It was possibly a sense of the inutility of striving to make merit a test of advancement against the traditions of the Horse Guards which rendered Wellington so indifferent about pressing the claims of those serving under him. It is noticeable that in Davout's correspondence very little is said about the mode in which supplies for the army were obtained; but, judging from the small sums asked for from time to time for the service of the troops, it is to be inferred, as indeed we know from other sources, that in peace as well as in war they were supplied by forced requisitions, levied, however, in Davout's command under system and in conformity with the maintenance of strict discipline. It may also be inferred that he was one of the few marshals who did not enrich themselves at the expense of the unfortunate countries overrun by the French armies. In ending a letter of this time (October 1808) to the Emperor, he says:—

'There remains one point which I must mention to your Majesty, whatever repugnance I may have in doing so. It is to beg you to grant me some extraordinary allowance in excess of the 10,000 francs per month which you have been good enough to give me. Neither in Silesia nor anywhere else have I taken any emoluments at the expense of the country, that being neither in accordance with your Majesty's intention nor with my own disposition. Nevertheless, the large fortune which your Majesty gave me in Poland was sufficient for all my expenses there, since it amounted to 25,000 or 30,000 francs per month, and that moreover I received six months in advance; but the fire which I suffered from in August involves rebuilding and other expenses which absorb for the time the greater part of my income. I blush, Sire, to enter into these details, but the position in which your Majesty places me involves considerable expenses, and I am obliged, therefore, on this account to apply to you.'

A few months later, while on short leave at Paris, he gives some account of the expenses he had incurred in the public service for a sort of informal intelligence department which he had organised and paid for from his private purse, and adds that 'the goodness of your Majesty has sufficed for all these expenses' up to the fire which he had suffered from in Poland:—

'This event, which diminishes for a time the income that I owe to the munificence of your Majesty, on account of the rebuilding which

I am obliged to undertake, and the necessity for the prompt repairs indispensable to the Hôtel Monaco in Paris, lately bestowed on me, which the Turkish Legation has left in a state of considerable disrepair, put me in a painful position. I have only available for these works about 8,000 francs [per month?] coming from the lands which your Majesty has given me in Westphalia. As they will amount to considerably more than that sum, and as the expenses of the army render it impossible for me to apply other funds to that purpose, I fear my wife may experience a want of money which will be extremely disagreeable to her. I beg your Majesty to take into consideration this view, which necessity and the goodness of your Majesty could alone have determined me to bring under your notice.'

The agreement come to at the Erfurt Conference involved the withdrawal of the French army from a part of the Prussian territories then occupied by it, and Davout in December 1808 transfers his headquarters from Berlin to Erfurt. From this time his correspondence is chiefly occupied with the preparations which were being made for the war to come with Austria, already looming in the distance. The infantry regiments with the army were increased by a fourth battalion, which brought up his command to 119 battalions, the companies being each 140 strong; the cavalry regiments had each 1,000 horses effective, and a considerable excess of men; and what was now called the Army of Germany was rapidly formed, under the command of Berthier, who represented the Emperor still remaining in Paris. Davout now reverted to the command of the Third Corps, which comprised his three old divisions—Morand, Friant, and Gudin—a fourth division made up of the new fourth battalions of regiments, a division of cuirassiers, and a division of German contingents.

Davout's reports were among the sources of information available to Napoleon which made it clear that the Austrians were prepared to resort to war, which nevertheless, when it broke out in the early summer of 1809, found the Emperor somewhat unprepared, the French army being widely scattered. Napoleon was still at Paris when the Austrian armies suddenly took the offensive, and Berthier by his irresolution suffered the French army, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Davout, which are stated very forcibly in this correspondence, to take up a perfectly false strategic position, which, but for the slowness and irresolution of the Austrians, would have involved it in great disaster. Napoleon arrived on the scene just in time to avert this, and then ensued all the complicated manœuvring and counter-manœuvring and numerous actions culminating in the battle of Eckmühl, the

loss of which drove the Austrians into retreat and opened the road to Vienna. Davout's corps had a prominent share in all these operations; and after the war he was created Prince of Eckmühl in recognition of his services. The Third Corps took also a prominent part in the great battle of Essling—a victory for the Austrians of which they made no proper use, and in the still bloodier battle of Wagram six weeks later, which ended the war.

Perhaps the most noticeable point in Davout's correspondence at this time is that the magnitude of the operations he took so important a part in would hardly be inferred from his account of them. He reports his corps being engaged on this day and on that, but treats the affair very much as a matter of course. Of Wagram he writes to Berthier, Prince of Neuchatel, Napoleon's Chief of the Staff:—

‘I have the honour to inform your Highness that I have established my headquarters to-day at Deutsch Wagram. I shall have the honour of sending you immediately a report of these two days [it does not appear that this report was ever furnished], but in the meantime I am bound to give the greatest praise in to-day's battle to the conduct of all my Army Corps, particularly the division Gudin. This general has received three gunshot wounds—one through the thigh, but happily not a dangerous wound—and he did not quit the field till some time after, when the affair was finished.’

It may be observed that the sober view of a battlefield taken by an old soldier like one of these French marshals is naturally more correct than that which is to be derived from the usual sources. For accounts of murderous fire, hailstorms of shot, superhuman courage displayed, and the like, we must go to the conventional historian, Alison, for example. The descriptions of battles given by that popular authority, and which no doubt the writer considered very powerful and graphic, are of course purely conventional. In these battles a great many men were killed and wounded, but then a great many men were engaged. If a battle lasts for seven or eight hours, and at the end of it four-fifths of the combatants are untouched, the fire can hardly with truth be described as murderous; for the majority of the combatants it has been innocuous, and if innocuous when lasting for so many hours, the expression ‘murderous’ as applied to the circumstances of any particular minute becomes still less appropriate. No doubt at certain particular times in a battle the men go down very fast, especially those in the front (at Wagram one division lost about two-thirds of its men in a single advance), but during the greater part of the

day the troops are not suffering great loss ; if they were there would soon be none of them left. In truth, the most remarkable thing about modern warfare, and it holds good equally for modern arms of precision, is the small amount of damage done compared with the means used. At Wagram more than 1,200 field guns came into action ; a very moderate estimate would give one hundred rounds per gun, or 120,000 cannon shot or shell fired off. The total number of killed and wounded being about 40,000, this would mean that two shots out of every three took no effect, even supposing that all the casualties were caused by artillery fire, and making no allowance for the effects of musketry, which as a matter of fact does by far the greater part of the mischief. In all probability not more than one in a hundred cannon shot did take effect. It is surely a crude way of going to work to shower a lot of iron balls promiscuously about the field on the chance of somebody coming in the way of a very small number of them ; nor is this crudeness of method sensibly diminished when for the old cannon-ball is substituted the modern shell, which is fired off on the chance that an occasional fragment as it bursts may tear some poor fellow to pieces. Alison, describing the death of Marshal Lannes, says :—‘ At that moment, Lannes, who had dismounted from his horse to avoid the dreadful fire of the artillery, which swept off everything above the heads of the soldiers, was struck by a cannon-ball which carried away both his legs.’ Apart from the obscure relation between cause and effect here indicated, of which the writer appears unconscious, this naïve description illustrates amusingly the conventional way of describing a battle. It does not seem to have occurred to the historian that if the cannon balls had been fulfilling the functions expected from them, they would have been sweeping off the heads of the soldiers and not everything above their heads. The fact is that, if you come to look into the thing, the object of firearms, whether called arms of precision or not, is not to kill or to wound, but to frighten ; for when an army is beaten it is not the killed and wounded that run away, but those who have got off scot free. It is this immunity for the majority which renders war possible. If arms of precision were really what they are called, and if artillery and musketry fire were really murderous, then every soldier in a battle would have to go to certain death, in which case he would probably decline to undertake the office, and war, the scourge of mankind, would become impossible.

After the peace with Austria which followed the Wagram campaign, Davout was left as Commander-in-Chief in Germany to carry out the arrangements consequent upon the Treaty of Vienna; and, these completed, he returned to France, spending there the greater part of the year 1810—the only considerable absence from the army which he enjoyed for nearly twenty years. Early in 1811 he was appointed to the command of what was called the Corps of Observation of the Elbe, with headquarters at Hamburg, and throughout that year was actively employed in the measures which were being pushed on for the augmentation of the French Army. His corps was gradually augmented to an effective strength of six divisions of infantry, with 80,000 men in all, to which were attached 60,000 Saxons and Poles, forming altogether an army of 140,000 men, destined to form part of the next Grand Army which invaded Russia in the following year. The augmentation took mainly the form of increasing the strength of regiments, which now had six battalions each, five of them on a war footing and one a depot. The infantry regiments were now 4,000 strong; the cavalry were kept at the strength of 1,100 men per regiment with 1,000 horses. In March 1812 the Army of Germany was renamed the Grand Army; the Third Corps was renumbered as the First, and shortly afterwards Davout was moved from Hamburg to Prussian Poland, and thence onwards to the war. The bloody battles round Smolensko broke up the brotherhood which had so long subsisted between the Corps Commander and his generals of division. The gallant Gudin, who with Friant and Morant had served under Davout from the earliest formation of the camp at Boulogne, was here mortally wounded; at Borodino Friant was wounded, the chief of the staff of the corps was mortally wounded, another general of division was killed, and all the other generals of the corps, including Davout himself, were hit. During the advance on Moscow Davout's reports and correspondence with army headquarters are methodically continued. They consist in a large measure of recommendations for the promotion of officers in the place of those who had fallen; the last promotion roll sent in is dated—Moscow, 5th October. There is nothing in these reports up to the date when the retreat begins—the 16th of October—to signify more than that the corps is put to considerable stress for food. Even during the retreat several official letters were addressed by Davout to the Major-General reporting different actions which the First Corps, for some time occupying the

honourable post of rearguard, had fought. Davout in these makes frequent reference to the *trainards* who were following the army and interfering with the movements of the troops. Napoleon, it will be remembered, left the army on the 5th of December, handing over the command to Murat. Davout's last official report is dated the 8th of December, near Wilna; he informs the Major-General that he has the greatest difficulty in bringing along the treasure because the wagons are too heavily laden, and because every moment its progress is interrupted, apparently by the swarm of fugitives.

'One wagon has been left on the other side of Smorgoni, and has been pillaged by stragglers from all the corps; I therefore found it necessary to substitute for the wagons, baggage animals to be taken from the different columns as best can be. Unless I adopt this measure the treasure will not be able to follow, and will be lost at the next steep hill.'

The wonder is that it should have been found possible, under such circumstances, to write letters at all. At this point the army broke up, and Davout's next letter is from Thorn, to report his arrival at that place on December 24. A week later he reports that the relics of the First Corps, which is gradually straggling into Thorn, may perhaps amount to 3,000 men, and that there are about 800 officers available. 'The principal reason' for this loss sustained 'is that, after leaving Smorgoni, the marches were so long that every man who left the road to seek for food was left behind and fell into the enemy's hands; the officers, on the other hand, not having strayed from the line of march, and having found some means of subsistence, have nearly all turned up.' The remarkable thing seems to be not that so many men should have been lost, but that, under the circumstances, any food at all should have been procured, or that any men should have survived. There must be something in the excitement of war to sustain the vital power. A man who, in peace time, slept out in the snow for a fortnight with only his clothes over him would assuredly die. These 3,000 men, the Marshal says, were in a dreadful state, many of them suffering from frostbitten hands and feet, involving some amputations, although he hopes not many; but the greater part of the sickness was due to malignant fever, from which 100 officers were suffering. Food could only be procured by armed requisitions made in the neighbouring districts. He proposes to keep a sufficient number of officers and sub-officers necessary for the small number of men, and to send all the rest back to France, where they would be

more useful for drilling the conscripts to be raised. Throughout there is no word of complaint, no indication of abated courage. His one idea is to maintain the struggle. But, stern soldier as he is, the courtier peeps out in a letter about this time to Duroc, who had gone off to Paris with Napoleon:—‘I can easily form an idea of the pleasure which has been caused in France at the news of the Emperor’s arrival. Although the army has met with great misfortunes since his departure, I regard that as of little importance now that I know our sovereign is in his capital.’ He adds:—‘The *morale* here is excellent, and every straggler who turns up will receive a good lesson in the *morale militaire*, and from good examples.’ He now proposes to re-form the First Corps by organising at Thorn regiments of one or two companies, each 100 strong, with six officers, and to send the rest to the regimental *dépôts*. Whatever may be the judgement passed on Napoleon’s abandonment of his army during the retreat, there is no doubt that he chose badly in selecting Murat to succeed him. Murat was now at Marienburg with Berthier, who seems to have lost his head, while Murat was principally occupied in considering how he could follow Napoleon’s example and get away himself; and Davout, in his letters, is not backward in expressions of indignation at the total want of forethought and energy displayed at this time. He was all for holding their ground and showing a bold front. Murat, however, fell back, and, arriving at Posen on January 15, made over the command of what remained of the army to Eugène, Napoleon’s son-in-law, and went off to his own kingdom of Naples. Napoleon confirmed Eugène in the command, and if Davout felt that he had established a better claim, the change was at any rate a gain to him, as he and Murat were on very bad terms, and high words had passed between them at various times during the retreat from Moscow.

The correspondence is now occupied with the measures taken for re-forming, or rather re-creating the army. A front line to meet immediate attack was constituted from the remains of the first battalions of regiments, while the cadres of the second battalions were posted along the line of Magdeburg-Erfurt, to be re-formed there. There are reported, too, all the complications following on the rising of the Prussians; Davout often refers to the insolence, as he calls it, of the Prussian officials, and on one occasion mentions that he had dislocated his thumb in thrashing a Prussian postilion whom the Marshal had summoned to his own room

to receive this personal chastisement. Davout had now for a time no definite command, but only a general control under Eugène of the troops in Western Germany, receiving orders partly direct from Paris, and partly from the nominal commander-in-chief. Perhaps it was because chafing under the position that he more than once applied for short leave to go home and see his family, which, however, Napoleon refused, on the grounds that he could not be spared, and eventually gave him a definite and independent command in North-Western Germany, with headquarters at Hamburg. His correspondence at this time gives a vivid picture of the tremendous efforts made by Napoleon in creating the army with which he took the field in the summer of 1813, and also of the administrative confusion which was a necessary result of the circumstances in which the French army was placed. Left in this independent charge, Davout took no immediate part in the Leipzig campaign, but was mainly occupied in passing on troops to the Grand Army as fast as the cadres were formed. After hostilities were resumed, on the conclusion of the armistice in August 1813, Napoleon was too much occupied with the business immediately before him to give any attention to Davout's command, and his last instructions to the Marshal are dated July 24. In these he commits to him the general command of the Lower Elbe and the adjacent countries on both sides. After this, although Davout continues to submit reports, he gets no further instructions. On November 6 he addresses a long report to the Emperor, in which he mentions that he has had no information from the Grand Army or instructions of any kind since August 16. He had not heard then of the catastrophe of Leipzig, which had happened three weeks before. This is his last report. He was now left to his own resources, and, Russians and Prussians pressing upon him, he was forced to give way by degrees, and finally to withdraw into Hamburg. He received, indeed, a note in cipher from General Carra Saint-Cyr, informing him that it was the Emperor's wish that he should leave a sufficient garrison in Hamburg, and work round with the bulk of his force into France by Holland. But it was then too late for him to do this, and on December 3 he enters within the lines of Hamburg, having then a total strength of about 42,000 men, of whom, however, already 8,000 were in hospital. In his celebrated defence of Hamburg, Davout was seen at his best; resolute, cheerful, full of resource, maintaining throughout the best form of defence—a vigorous offensive, making con-

stant sorties on the enemy's advanced works, harassing him at all points. The difficulties of the defence were enormously increased by the severe frost of that winter, which deprived the defenders of all the advantage offered at other times by the river and its branches; island posts which, but for the ice, would have been unassailable, were just as much exposed to the enemy's attacks as if they had been surrounded with dry land. The greater part of his troops were young conscripts who had had no training in musketry—it is mentioned that they were exercised in target practice throughout this defence whenever there was leisure—and their sufferings from frost and fever were great. It needs not be said that the defence was successful. Towards the end of March the ice began to break up, when the position resumed its impregnable form. In his report, Davout says of this period of the defence—

‘We were now in hopes of improving the condition of our sick, of whom nearly a thousand died in the month of March alone. The soldiers had learned to fight like veteran troops, and so perfect was the discipline maintained that during the blockade not an officer or man had to be punished for any grave offence. The troops were well clothed and paid up to date, and had plenty of underclothing and shoes. We had preserved 2,000 good cavalry and 1,500 artillery horses, the foraging for which no longer caused difficulty, since the various sorties made had provided us with means of feeding them. We had still salt pork, bacon, and wine enough to last us for six months more.’

On April 18 the Russian General communicated to the blockaded army news of the capture of Paris and Napoleon's abdication, to which the Marshal replied that a man of honour does not consider himself relieved from his oath of fidelity because his sovereign has suffered a reverse; and when on April 20 the Russian General demanded permission to send some officers into Hamburg to deliver to the Marshal the despatches of the French Government, he replied that the Emperor would not employ Russian officers if he wished to convey despatches, and refused to receive the officers. In this matter, the editor observes, the Marshal, like a faithful soldier, was acting strictly in accordance with the Decree of 1811, relative to the duties of officers in command of fortified posts in time of war. In the absence of any orders or direct official information, he was determined to fulfil his duties to the end, and to listen to nothing which bore an appearance of surrender, however disguised. All that he would agree to was to send one of his officers to Paris to get information. Eventually a relation of his own, who had been sent from

Paris by his wife, arrived at Altona bringing French newspapers. This M. Davout was admitted into Hamburg, and on April 29 the Marshal announced to the army the events which had happened in France, and hoisted the white flag. In the following month Davout's army marched out on the road to France with arms, baggage, and artillery, still 31,000 strong, including 5,000 sick who followed at a later date, 100 guns, and 4,000 horses. The Marshal, however, was no longer in command. His obstinacy in refusing to recognise the fall of the Empire added to the many complications which rendered the position of the new French Government so difficult, while his known devotion to the Emperor naturally made his employment distasteful to the King. Early in May, General Count Gérard had been sent to Hamburg to supersede him, and on returning to France he was prohibited from coming to Paris. This treatment of the Marshal, who had so nobly maintained the honour of the French arms to the last, was probably also partly a consequence of the complaints made against him of severities practised towards the people of Hamburg. The correspondence now published throws an important light on this subject. It appears that the tremendous requisitions and fines levied on Hamburg in 1813 as a punishment for its manifestations in favour of Prussia, were made under the express orders of Napoleon; that Davout repeatedly remonstrated against these orders as involving an excessive penalty; and that in fact the actual fines and penalties inflicted by him were much less than those ordered by the Emperor, while the strict discipline he maintained among his troops must have gone far to mitigate his own personal harshness of manner. If he was a hard man he was at least a just and honest one, according to the standard of a French marshal, and it may be inferred that he was free from the personal rapacity which disgraced so many of Napoleon's lieutenants.

The disfavour shown to Davout by the Royal Government, and the fact that he had never been called on to make any declaration of allegiance to it, left him free to offer his services to Napoleon on his return from Elba, and he hastened to Paris and waited on him the very day he re-entered the Tuileries. Napoleon immediately pressed on him the Ministry of War, an office which, however, Davout was very reluctant to accept, pleading that his manners and habits rendered him unsuitable for an administrative appointment of that sort. Napoleon urged in confidential terms the gravity of his position, his isolation in the face of Europe in

coalition against him, and that he would soon have to place himself at the head of the army, and must leave at Paris a man upon whom he could depend; ending by saying, 'I am alone: will you abandon me?' The Marshal, thus appealed to, accepted the post, and during the Hundred Days applied himself with his habitual zeal and power of work to the task of reorganising the army. His share in the marvellous work was second only to that of Napoleon himself, for in three months the old Imperial army was on foot again, but Davout's quick temper brought him more than once during this time to high words with his master. The dramatic completeness of the climax to the Hundred Days is illustrated by two letters. On June 19 Davout acknowledges a letter from Soult, then attached to Napoleon as chief of the staff, announcing the victory [of Ligny] gained by the Emperor on the 16th. On the 20th he telegraphs to the Governor of Lisle:—

'The Army of the North, after having gained a complete victory on the 16th, attacked the enemy in front of Brussels on the 18th. After the most signal advantages, just as it was on the point of reaping the fruit of them, by one of those events beyond human calculation it has been obliged to retreat. The losses are very heavy on both sides. You are likely to be left for some time to your own resources; use vigour and constancy to preserve to the Emperor and the country the important post entrusted to you. Pass on this notice to all the commandants of fortified places of the sixteenth division. Perhaps the enemy may have got hold of the cipher, so take care.'

Davout's first efforts after the catastrophe were given to collecting whatever of the army he could get together round Paris, ready to continue the defence of the country. Napoleon reached Paris on June 21. Davout tried to induce him to take energetic measures at once, to adjourn the Chambers, rally all his forces, make an appeal to the country, and so forth; 'he found the Emperor broken down.' Even then, however, when he saw that the maintenance of the Empire in any form was impossible, and after he had himself recognised Louis, Davout was still not ready to give up the game; he struggled to avert a complete military collapse; his aim was to maintain the French army in an effective condition, and that peace should be made only while it stood face to face with its adversaries, on a recognised footing of equality. As M. de Mazarde observes—

'The mission which he had undertaken was truly as painful as difficult, with an army ill disposed to yield, still passionately attached to Napoleon, exasperated and demoralised by defeat, menaced with

insults by the enemy who, under the pretext of watching it, followed and harassed it in its retreat. Davout had become in fact a sort of plenipotentiary of that army of which the reconstituted Royal Government affected to no longer recognise the legal existence or rights. He had at the same time to protect the army against the Government and to protect it against disorganisation; he had to maintain it in obedience and discipline, and to negotiate its submission while preserving its pride and interests. Davout managed to combine these duties with the higher qualities of patriotism and honour.'

Eventually, under his orders, the army, which had been withdrawn behind the Loire, mounted again the white flag; and then, in obedience to the King's command, he made over the command of it to Marshal Macdonald preparatory to its being broken up. He stood up manfully for the generals who appeared at first to be marked out for vengeance for the part taken by them during the Hundred Days. His own hands were clean, at any rate; but although not brought to trial himself, he was for a long time interned at Louviers under police supervision. It was not till after some years that the Prince of Eckmühl, already restored to his rank of Marshal of France, was called up to the Chamber of Peers. The hardships of war had apparently left no mark on his strong frame, but a life of inaction proved more trying to his constitution than the fatigues of war, and he survived the fall of the Empire only eight years, dying in June 1823, having then, after twenty years of continued employment as a general, and eight of retirement, barely reached the age at which in ordinary times an able and fortunate soldier may hope to emerge from subordinate rank. Nations undergo tribulation when such a career is possible. Happy the country whose generals are old!

We may observe in conclusion that the task of editing these letters was entrusted to M. de Mazado by the Countess de Cambacérès, the daughter of the Marshal, and they could not have been placed in better hands. But, acting under the direction of the family, the editor has evidently glossed over some of the most questionable passages in the Marshal's career, in order to present as favourable a view as possible of his hero, and has made some statements which might be controverted. But we have no wish to enter upon debatable ground, and we accept the work as a valuable contribution to the history of the First Empire.

ART. VIII.—*Geology, Chemical, Physical, and Stratigraphical.*

By JOSEPH PRESTWICH, M.A., F.R.S., F.G.S., Professor of Geology in the University of Oxford. 8vo. London: 1886.

WHEN we consider for how many centuries history, politics, medicine, and even the study of animals and plants, have occupied men's minds, it may well be a matter of surprise that the science of their terrestrial dwelling place dates from but yesterday. It is true that ignorance of geography was long an insuperable bar to any really satisfactory geological progress, but the removal of that obstacle did not alone suffice to enable the study of the earth to develop as it should have developed. Its retardation was largely due to a generally received belief that we already 'knew all about it.' A narrow literalism in the interpretation of Hebrew poetry, guarded and maintained by the formidable powers of which ecclesiastical authority disposed, had led men to attribute the forms and dispositions of mountains and valleys, as well as their mineral composition, to the immediate action of divine creative power, only modified by subsequent diluvial action. Thus it came about that when the real existence of fossil marine shells far inland and on hills above the sea level became widely recognised, they were generally referred to the action of the one universal deluge. The publication of Buffon's '*Théorie de la Terre*' (which so startled the ecclesiastical faculty of Paris that its censured author had to make a retractation) marks approximately the commencement of any wide diffusion of scientific geological speculations. This was just before the middle of the last century, though it was only towards its close that rock masses came to be more systematically studied and better understood. Then Werner, Hutton, Dolomieu, Saussure, and others, showed that the earth consisted partly of stratified sedimentary rocks and partly of others which were unstratified.

Though fossils had then come to be recognised as relics of past life of different kinds and in different degrees divergent from existing life, nevertheless little was understood of the order of succession of that life on the earth till 1799, when the researches of William Smith proved not only that the various strata held a definite and uniform relation one to the other, but also that each group had its own distinctive set of fossils—each past period of the world's history being

characterised by the possession of different forms of animal and vegetable life.

The earlier geologists were, as is well known, occupied with vigorous controversy about the respective shares which aquatic and igneous agencies had taken in the formation of the earth's crust, but a general disposition existed to account for geological phenomena by a liberal allowance of cataclysms and convulsions far exceeding anything which the modern world could be supposed anywhere to exhibit.

In opposition to this convulsionist and cataclysmal school, there arose one of the greatest of modern geologists, the late Sir Charles Lyell, who sought to prove that there was no evidence that the world had ever presented phenomena brought about by agencies different even in degree from those which act at the present time, and he triumphantly showed, in many instances, that a liberal, yet not unreasonable, allowance of time would account for several geological facts not previously thought to be so simply explicable. But Sir Charles Lyell's system, which is known as 'uniformitarianism,' is an example of one extreme begotten by an opposite exaggeration. After having been for a time widely accepted, it is now thought by many to be untenable. Even its author began in his later days to modify his own views very materially under the widereaching influence of Darwin and the theory of evolution.

The work to a review of which this article is devoted will afford some aid to the reaction against extreme uniformitarianism. Mr. Prestwich, in his just published 'Geology,' himself points out that the fundamental question of the relation in this respect between *time and force* has given rise to two schools, one of which adopts uniformity of action in all time, while the other considers that the physical forces were more active and energetic during past geological periods than they are at present. One school considers that the causes at present in action on the surface of the globe are not only those which have ever been in action, but also maintains that at all former periods they have been *equal in kind and in degree*, and that the energy with which the forces of nature now operate are sufficient, *with unlimited time*, to account for all past phenomena. The other school, on the contrary, considers that, while identical in kind, the causes in operation in past times were affected by a more active and energetic action of those forces than obtains at present. The discussion of this question, he tells us, 'must be reserved until the reader is master of the facts

‘of this science;’ but he nevertheless declares his own view to be that ‘while the laws of chemistry and physics are ‘unchangeable and as permanent as the material universe ‘itself, the exhibition of the consequences of those laws in ‘their operation on the earth has been, as new conditions ‘and new combinations successively arose in the course of its ‘long geological history, one of constant variation in degree ‘and intensity of action.’ To this modified and, as we think, most rational uniformitarianism, we give in our cordial adhesion.

Not on this account alone, but for many other reasons besides, we welcome with great satisfaction the appearance of this work on Geology by the present professor of that science at Oxford. It is to consist of two volumes, of which only one is now published, though the other, we hope, will speedily follow. The work has been very long in preparation—so long that we have not been free from fear lest some untoward accident should deprive us of the advantage of its publication under its author’s personal supervision. For more than half a century Professor Prestwich has been known as a worker and author in his favourite science—a science he loved so well that not all the distractions and anxieties attending a mercantile career perceptibly diminished either his ardour for or his eminence in it, while exclusive devotion to it was the eagerly adopted first consequence of merited commercial success. Occupied at the beginning of his scientific career with the oldest fossiliferous formations, he has come to be perhaps the greatest living authority on all which concerns the latest tertiary and post-tertiary strata.

His just published volume may be said to be complete in itself, and being devoted to preliminary studies, which are very clearly set forth, it is just the work required by any one who would begin the study of geology. The volume which is to follow will be occupied by descriptions of the earth’s strata, with their contained fossils, concluding with those theoretical questions connected with cosmical and physical phenomena which relate to the history of the evolution of our planet.

The first object of the beginner in geological science should be to make himself acquainted with the materials of which the subject of his study—the earth—is composed, and the laws which govern them. On this account our author (whose first chapters are intended for those who approach the subject for the first time) has divided his present

volume into two parts: (1) A description of the minerals and rocks which form the crust of the earth, tracing the combination of elementary substances that enter into the minerals forming the rocks, together with the characters of the different rocks so formed; (2) An exposition of the various agencies which have acted on those materials both under existing and under past conditions. The second part begins with the fourth chapter, wherein are described those processes of change by which the older rocks, in consequence of alteration and decomposition, have come to furnish the materials out of which newer rocks have arisen. These latter, stratified, rocks consist of the insoluble residue of the primeval unstratified rocks, the soluble constituents of which have found their way into the ocean—their common receptacle—being carried there by surface waters. The stratified rocks thus formed consist of a very limited number of substances, comparatively indestructible save by wear and tear often resulting in stratigraphical reconstructions. In the next (fifth) chapter the past life of the earth is briefly reviewed, and to this succeeds a series of very interesting and admirably written treatises on the actions of rivers and tides, meteorological agencies, underground waters and springs, ice action, volcanoes and earthquakes, coral islands, faults and cleavage, mountain ranges, metalliferous deposits, igneous rocks, and metamorphism.

This book, therefore, contains in abundance all that is necessary for any one who would make a beginning in this science. Nevertheless, it is not by the reading, however attentively, of books, however excellent, but by the observation of Nature herself, that geology—like every natural science—can alone be fruitfully investigated. As Professor Prestwich expressly tells us, the fundamental and indispensable qualification for the geological student is accurate and true observation in the field, the habit of carefully recording facts on the spot, and the power of discerning the bearing of all the various phenomena that come before him, and apportioning their relative value. Without this the abstract sciences are of no avail; and the student will often find himself launched in a wrong direction, and in fruitless inquiries. The real class rooms of a geologist are to be found in quarries, pits, railway sections, cliffs, mountain passes, and ravines. To these the student must resort, to obtain that mastery of the science which will enable him to interpret facts rightly and to draw conclusions justly. It is this direct study of nature, this exploration of ground ever

new, this contact with scenery ever varied, this constant exercise of the powers of observation, with the seeing and handling of the forms of life long passed away, that gives real geological knowledge and power. It is the acquisition of the positive facts and the ever novel subjects of thought and reflection which the varied phenomena present, that constitute so great a charm and pleasure to those engrossed in special research, or to those who are merely in search of healthful change, new scenes and ideas, and recreation. Amongst the striking objects which meet the eye of the pedestrian in the extreme south-west of our island are the granite rocks of fantastic shape which form the wellknown 'Tors' of Devonshire and Cornwall.

'The decomposition of granite' (our author tells us) 'is not confined to the surface, but extends to considerable depths; and, as it is a feature of common occurrence, it constitutes an important factor in considering questions of denudation. It must be remembered, however, that the process of decay is very variable, depending on the nature of the felspar, and upon climatic temperature and humidity. Thus, while the granite monuments of Egypt have remained unaltered for ages, the recent monuments of St. Petersburg already show symptoms of decay. Again, in this country, some of the Cornish granites (Lamorna, Penryn, &c.) furnish solid and enduring materials for our public monuments, while others (St. Austell, &c.) are so decomposed as to form a mass of quartz grit and white clay (kaolin), that can be readily removed with pickaxe and spade. Over large tracts in Cornwall, France, Spain, India, Central Asia, and elsewhere, the granite is so disintegrated that the country presents a surface of fine quartz grit or gravel, while the granite of the Alps, of Aberdeen, and many other places is subject to little change. The depth to which decomposition extends is very variable; sometimes to a few feet, at others to more than a hundred feet; the decay is also irregular' (p. 55).

Some difference in crystallisation or in composition may render certain portions of a granite mass more indestructible than others, and such resisting centres may give rise to one of the most peculiar features of a granite district. For, wherever the denuding forces have been sufficient to remove the grit (resulting from decomposition) but insufficient to remove the undecomposed blocks, the ground either becomes strewn with such blocks or they are left in place superposed one on the other, and it is to this cause that are due the many isolated 'Tors' so characteristic of the scenery of Dartmoor, the Land's End, and other granite districts.

In connexion with the question of denudation, Professor Prestwich makes some very important observations which

tend to support that modified uniformitarianism which he advocates. He tells us :—

‘The importance of this process of rock decay on questions of denudation and time, has not hitherto received sufficient consideration ; and yet it cannot be too strongly insisted on. It is clear that all sedimentary strata have been derived from the destruction of pre-existing rocks, and all the estimates of geological time required for the accumulation of these strata have been based on the denudation of the land as now affected. At present the wear of land surfaces is, on the whole, very slow, being almost entirely mechanical, and only chemical in the case of calcareous rocks. The rivers carry down the loam, clay, and sand, and the loose fragments of the comparatively indestructible rocks, forming the great bulk of the existing land ; or the sea, pounding on the coast, breaks up and distributes similar débris.

‘The sedimentary strata, which consist of the débris of older surfaces, being altogether derivative, it is evident that, as we go back in geological time, their extent was less and less, and that with the progress of time, first, portions of the original surface of the globe, and then, in succession as formed, the Archæan and Palæozoic rocks, have been covered up and hidden under successive sedimentary strata. Consequently there was a time when the whole surface consisted of some form of crystalline or igneous rocks—rocks subject even in our present atmosphere to much decomposition, and doubtlessly in the atmosphere of past times to a decomposition far more rapid ; and these rocks, always subject to decay and alteration of texture, must have yielded to wear and removal with a facility unknown amongst mechanically formed and detrital strata where erosion alone operates. The entire area of the original crust, the extensive areas of the Archæan rocks, and the widely spread extrusive rocks of Palæozoic times, furnished materials subject to constant change and decay—a decay probably not regular and uniform, but, like that of granite and basalt at the present day, affecting some parts more than others. Is it not even possible that the old surfaces of these rocks in Palæozoic and later times may represent only the harder cores and more indestructible portions of original masses of greater extent, and of which the decayed and less resisting portions have been removed and lost ?

‘We have, therefore, in this early condition of the land surfaces, a reason why degradation and denudation should have proceeded with much more rapid strides than at present, and one reason also why, as a consequence of the abundance of materials, the earlier formations were built up of such large dimensions and thickness, and further, why the dimensions of the strata, on the whole, decrease in volume from the earlier to the present times. This may not be the sole reason, but it is a factor equally important with that of time.

‘All the calculations, therefore, of the length of geological time based upon the evidence furnished by denudation as now known, seem to me to be fallacious, and to have led to serious error in assigning to that time the unlimited length which, based on data applicable only to

parts of the case, has, in dealing with this question in its relation to the antiquity of the globe, led to such measures being assumed to be applicable to the whole term.'

We think these weighty words merit the serious consideration of those who may be still inclined to follow ultra-uniformitarianism.

Again, as to the question concerning the age of those deposits at the mouths of rivers known as 'deltas,' our author tells us, with respect to attempts which have been made to estimate the time taken in their formation, that prudence demands of us a considerable scepticism. According to Mr. Horner, it would have required, at the present rate of deposit, 13,500 years to accumulate the 39 feet of Nile sediment which underlies the statue of Rameses, and for the corresponding portion of the delta, 17,000 years. It has also been calculated that not less than 21,600 years would be needed for the delta of the Ganges, while for that of the Rhone one geologist formed the low estimate of 6,500 years. But, as Mr. Prestwich says:—

'It is difficult to form correct estimates of the age of deltas with the data in our possession; they cannot certainly be calculated altogether at the present rate of deposition, and as most deltas go back in all probability to the glacial period, they must originally, with the greater floods of those times, have grown more rapidly formerly than at present. Again, as the rocks inland become barer and the gradients less, the quantity of material carried to sea must become annually smaller' (pp. 88 and 89).

One of the more important phenomena bearing on geological questions is that of the formation of river valleys. In their excavation a twofold process goes on. When the gradient is considerable—as is commonly the case in the upper courses of rivers—the water erodes and excavates the surface over which it flows. When, however, the water flows through a very flat district, as is commonly the case towards a river's mouth, the river deposits the sediment brought down from the higher reaches, and so raises the level of its own bed and of such adjacent plots as its floods may reach. We have but a too striking example of this action in the river Po, where the task of contending with the gradual elevation of the river's bed tasks the energies of the Government most seriously.

If, on the contrary, the river has to traverse a hilly country, such that a sufficient gradient is maintained to the coast line, it then excavates a deep channel, bordered by

heights to its mouth, as in the instance of the Tyne, the Tweed, and other rivers.

It has doubtless often happened that slow changes in the level of the land have taken place—either a gradual depression, when (as in the earlier stages of the Thames) deposition towards the river's mouth is brought about, or a gradual elevation (as in parts of the Avon and the Somme), producing a deeper valley excavation.

‘But a different and more usual mode of valley excavation, especially when the ground consists of soft or homogeneous strata and the gradient is moderate, as in such river basins as those of the Thames, the Seine, the Somme, and others, is for the river to deepen its channel simultaneously throughout, and at the same time to widen the valley. For when, in periods of flood or from other causes, the river shifts its position and attacks one side of the valley more than the other, the valley is enlarged unequally, the river undermining one side according to variation in the water power at particular times, and cutting back into the valley side. In this way the valleys often present gentle slopes and terraces on one side, and escarped banks on the other, against which the river has been at one time more strongly deflected, as with the Thames when its valley extended to the range of low tertiary hills from Greenwich to Erith, or the several picturesque escarpments in the valley of the Evenlode, between Handborough and Charlbury, in Oxfordshire, or in the valley of the Cherwell at Enslow. As the old rivers gradually excavated the valley channels deeper, they left here and there portions of their drifted materials on terraces at the level at which they flowed in successive times’ (p. 92).

Thus we may meet with shells left high and dry above a river's present level, in sheltered positions or in raised terraces. It is in such positions that were found those first determined flint implements, in the examination and verification of the true position and nature of which Professor Prestwich himself bore so important a part. The process of valley excavation is exceptionally well shown in the district of the Ardennes. The beauties of that picturesque region are entirely due to its rivers, and are found only in their courses. The country is generally a flat table land, consisting of Palæozoic rocks, which have been worn down to one general level by the action of very ancient seas. On this flat region the rivers have worn courses of a depth of 500 or 600 feet; and it is between the generally steep boundaries of these narrow valleys, often well clothed with trees, shrubs, and ferns, that all the beauties of the Ardennes are to be discovered.

As to the wear and tear of coasts, that of course mainly depends on the hardness of the rocks presented to the sea's

action, but also in part to the presence of land springs. The hard primary rocks of the coasts of Cornwall, Devon, and South Wales show (by the raised beaches sheltered here and there amongst their prominences) how little the shore line has changed since a very early geological period; while on the coast of Dorset, west of Portland, the soft strata have yielded rapidly, and the coast line has correspondingly receded.

The rapid wear of such soft strata as chalk is well seen in the cliffs of Kent and Sussex, where the loss of land (when not protected) may average from 1 to 2 feet a year. Thus an old map shows that the chalk cliffs between Eastbourne and Beachy Head lost one third of a mile between 1736 and 1844, though it is estimated that less than one foot a year has been lost at Beachy Head itself. Nevertheless the lastmentioned headland must, like Shakespeare's Cliff, have been once much higher than it is at present, since the land in each case gains in altitude seawards.

Many geologists are of opinion that all limestone rocks are exclusively the result of organic growth and consist entirely of corals, nullipores, molluscs, crinoids, foraminifera, &c., and their débris. This view is, however, questioned by Professor Prestwich, who observes that we have indeed 'clear evidence of the formation at the present day of limestones as solid and compact as those of the Carboniferous and Devonian series;' and that, as regards the chalk, we have 'evidence of so vast a profusion of foraminifera that in places they constitute almost the entire mass of the rock.' He asks, however, 'Have all lime rocks a similar organic origin? It is a *vera causa* so far as it goes, but there is often a large proportion of amorphous carbonate of lime in the calcareous strata, to which it is difficult to assign such an origin.'

These fossils are, of course, the modified relics of the animal and vegetable remains which are everywhere carried down, together with sediment, by flooded rivers. In Europe, owing to conditions induced by civilisation, these remains are now relatively little abundant; but in less populous and more uncultivated countries, the destruction of animal and vegetable life is much larger, and remains much more abundant, so that if the sea bed or deltas were now raised the organic remains found in such modern deposits would furnish the observer with such things as preserved shells and scales of fishes of the sea, and with fragments of land plants and water plants brought down and deposited by rivers.

'Thus,' he reminds us, that 'in the earlier deposits in the estuary of the Thames there are found, together with the common shells now living on its marshy banks, remains of the red deer, wild boar, wolf, and other animals once roaming wild on the shore of that river, together with the remains of the indigenous vegetation, such as the oak and the Scotch pine, the poplar, the hazel, the yew, and a few other trees and shrubs.

'The Ganges, on the other hand, still carries down on its waters carcasses of buffaloes, deer, tigers, and the other wild animals of the country, together with palms and other trees of tropical growth; and portions of all these are entombed in the delta deposit, with the shells and fish remains of the adjacent seas.

'So, again, the Mississippi transports tangled rafts of trees which it has uprooted from its upland shores; and these, together with portions of the fauna of the lands devastated by the floods, are carried down and deposited in the Gulf of Mexico, where they mingle with the more tropical forms of life living in that sea.

'As we recede from the mouths of these rivers, the reliquiae of the land brought down by them become scarcer, until ultimately in the deposits formed in the more open seas surrounding the continents there are only marine organisms to be found; so that while there are, at certain points, beds containing a land flora and fauna, alternately with others having a marine fauna, elsewhere over the larger sea or ocean areas there exist diverse synchronous deposits containing nothing but marine fossils. At the same time the lithological character of the deposits varies from the coarse littoral to the fine deep-sea beds; while the thickness of the whole varies also according to the distance from land, the set of currents, and the magnitude of the rivers' (p. 103).

The phenomena thus presented by the world of our own day offer a safe clue to, and present a true analogy with, those of ancient times. There have always been rivers, seas, and lakes, and sedimentary deposits have ever been found in them, from very early geological epochs. Thus it is that the remains of the various forms of animal and vegetable life which have successively inhabited this planet, have been here and there preserved sparsely or copiously according to the varying circumstances of each case. Thus also it is that the rocks which have been successively deposited, reveal—by the facts of their relations of superposition, as well as by their fossil contents—what has been the nature of the flora and fauna which bordered the banks of ancient rivers, what animals waded or swam in their estuaries, or inhabited the beds of those seas into which they poured their waters.

Such rivers have at all times largely contributed to the supply of lime and other salts to the ocean, and this again is shown by the phenomena we have before our eyes to-day. Thus the Thames is continually removing large quantities

of such substances from the land and taking them to the sea. Its basin above Kingston has an area of 3,675 square miles, and never less than 350 millions of gallons of water (drained from the surface of this basin) pass daily by Kingston, and on an average not less than 1,250 millions of gallons pass by it daily. About nineteen grains of solid and mineral matter—mainly derived from the oolites and chalk of Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Gloucestershire—are contained in each gallon of such water, apart from extra quantities of sediment carried down in floods. Thus no less than 1,514 tons of such substance are carried away from this area daily, and 552,610 tons of it annually. Two thirds of this consists of carbonate of lime, derived from the chalk and oolite regions above mentioned, which offer a surface of 2,072 square miles. Thus 140 tons of this substance are annually removed from each square mile of the area in question, which rate of denudation would, it is calculated, lower its whole surface one inch in each thousand years.*

Of the enormous quantities of carbonate of lime thus carried into the ocean by all the rivers of the world, a considerable portion is probably thrown down by precipitation and converted into sulphate of lime, but the greater portion goes to form the calcareous substances which enter so largely into the composition of many animals, notably of corals and shell fish. How profuse is the supply available for this purpose has been shown by Bischof.† He found that as sea water contains about $\frac{1}{1000}$ th part of its weight of carbonate of lime, every oyster requires for the formation of its shell 50,000 times its own weight of water. But the volume of water poured into the sea each year by the Rhine is so great that he estimated it would yield enough carbonate of lime to form the shells of 332,539 millions of oysters.

Many geologists, as before remarked, think that our limestone rocks are entirely the result of organic growths, and consist of nothing but corals, shell fish, Echinoderms, foraminifera, &c., whole and in more or less comminuted fragments. They also think that while the mechanically formed conglomerates, sandstones, shoals, and clays were accumulated near the shores or at a moderate distance from the land, the limestones were on the other hand thus built up

* See Ramsey's 'Physical Geology and Geography of Great Britain,' 5th edit., chap. xxxii., 1878, and Prof. Prestwich's Anniversary Address for 1872, in 'Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc.'

† Chemical and Physical Geology, vol. i. p. 80.

by living organisms in the more open seas. Our author, however, questions, as we have seen, the former view, because the lower chalk here and there contains no traces of foraminifera, but consists of these masses of amorphous carbonate of lime with a veritable admixture of alumina, silica, &c. Nevertheless, he freely admits that great limestone masses are now being built up by coral animals in tropical seas, as also that our chalk masses consist in places almost entirely of foraminifera.

Sorby,* while advocating the organic origin of limestones generally, admits that large parts consist of fine granular particles, respecting which it is impossible to say whether they have had an organic origin, or have been derived from older rocks ground down or from carbonate of lime precipitated in granules, as some, he tells us, most certainly have been.

The accumulation of calcareous organic remains in freshwater lakes is sometimes extraordinary. In some of the large lakes of America the myriads of decomposing shells have formed thick beds of white marl, in which only a few stray *Uniones*, *Planorbis*, and *Limnææ*, have escaped destruction, so that should they become hardened they would form limestones very much like those of some of the great tertiary freshwater formations of Continental Europe.

Our author has some valuable remarks on the interesting question which concerns littoral and deep-sea deposits, upon which much light has of late been thrown by exploring expeditions, the most noteworthy of which is that recently made by H.M.S. 'Challenger.'

The important conclusion which has thus been arrived at is, that there is not a general distribution of life over the great ocean beds, since (though life exists at all depths) large tracts in the various zones seem to be empty and barren. The population of the open oceans may, it seems, according to our author, be divided into two classes, the one inhabiting the deep ocean bed, the other living on the surface waters only; while the intermediate depths of water are void of life. Professor Prestwich also calls attention to the important fact that, although we are introduced, in these depths, to many new and curious genera and species, and to forms very analogous to those of some past geological periods, yet no genera or species which were thought actually extinct have yet been recovered, with the

* See Anniversary Address, Geol. Soc. 1879, pp. 91 and 92.

exception of one or two foraminifera and a few Pliocene mollusca. Nor does he think that any forms have been discovered which present a greater analogy with extinct forms than might have been expected from the analogy of physical conditions existing between modern and ancient ocean beds: just as the creatures found in shallower waters formerly explored were found to resemble the ancient inhabitants of shallow waters. It must be remembered, however, that the explorations of the deep ocean, although extending over wide areas, form but the finest of lines across comparatively unlimited plains. Much has doubtless been done, but an immense deal yet remains to be done, and we do not know, of course, what future researches may bring to light. Still analogy may lead us rather to expect to find that forms already discovered have an unexpectedly wide extension, than to find forms altogether aberrant from those of the present period.

Professor J. Fuchs* has made the curious suggestion that the distribution of life, both in shallow and deep seas, is regulated rather by conditions of light than of temperature. He thinks that the depth of 300 feet may be regarded as the boundary of the littoral fauna, which he regards as *the fauna of light*. Beyond this is a comparatively sterile region with only a few stragglers from above and below, and this sterile region he regards as extending down to about 500 feet. Below that depth we come upon the deep-sea fauna or *the fauna of darkness*.

With respect to the depth of the ocean and the currents which traverse it, it appears that notwithstanding the inequalities of the land and the altitude of the mountain ranges, the mean height of the continents above the level of the sea is very far from equalling the depth of the depression below the sea. Humboldt estimates the mean height of the land to be 671 feet in Europe, 1,062 feet in Asia, 702 feet in North America, and 1,082 feet in South America above the level of the ocean. The greater portion of these continental areas is of very moderate height, and the mountain chains are only long, narrow, elevated ridges a few miles in width. The ocean depths, on the contrary, form not inverted ridges, but vast depressions of great extent both longitudinally and transversely. The valleys of the ocean present little resemblance to those of the land; they are deep basins or broad troughs, generally of much uniformity,

* Magazine of Nat. Hist. for January 1883.

and extending without interruption for hundreds or even thousands of miles. In the Atlantic Ocean, for instance, there are two long troughs from 12,000 to 20,000 feet deep, between which arises an irregular ridge only about 6,000 feet below the surface. Altogether it would appear that the mass of the land above the sea level is, to the volume of water, in the proportion of not more than 1 to 42.

Distant from land as the deeper of the great ocean troughs are, there is reason, in Professor Prestwich's opinion, to believe that ocean currents sweep over their whole breadths and reach down to their greatest depths; for everywhere is the composition of the ocean waters alike, and everywhere a similar order in the distribution of temperature at similar depths prevails. Consequently, the finer débris of the land carried incessantly down into the seas by all the rivers of the world is, when the action of the river water ceases, caught up by these great marine currents, and swept to places far beyond the more apparent tidal action. It is only when the seas are inclosed, or when the ocean currents are weak, that the check to this river action leads to the earlier precipitation of the transported materials and to the ready formation of deltas.

The geological interest of the great ocean currents consists not only in the transport of sediment, seeds, and plants to great distances, but also in their influence on land climates. A certain number of these currents proceed from the Arctic and Antarctic seas and sweep down towards the Equator, while others proceed from the Equator to the Polar regions. Thus while the cold currents sweeping down from the Greenland seas carry ice and cold water down the east coast of North America to lat. 40° N., the Gulf Stream and equatorial current carry northward their warm waters and deflect the winter's isotherm of 32° to the high northern latitude of 70°, between Iceland and the North Cape. The limits of the drift ice which in the Arctic Atlantic lies between Spitzbergen and Nova Zembla, in lat. 75° N., reaches the above lat. 70° (or 300 to 400 miles further south) in the seas north of Behring's Strait, because those narrow and shallow straits stay the passage northwards of the warm south currents of the Pacific. Did an analogous condition of things exist in this region, i.e. did a belt of land between Britain and Greenland intercept the warm stream of the South Atlantic, then might we see the mountains of Norway and Sweden again invested (as are those of Greenland in nearly parallel latitudes) with a permanent sheet of ice and

snow. The warm stream of the South Atlantic now referred to is the Gulf Stream, the rapidity of which rapidly diminishes as it proceeds northwards and eastwards. The rapidity possible for an ocean current is very conspicuous at St. Paul's Rocks, where Professor Moseley observed * the equatorial current rushing past with the velocity of a mill race, and sufficing to baffle the attempts of the crew of a ship's boat to pull against it.

In the chapter which treats of meteorological agencies, our author points out how permanent for long periods the surface soil of large tracts of country may remain, and this in spite of the interesting fact, pointed out by Darwin, how by the mere agency of earthworms a stony field may become buried in soil in the course of a generation or two. Yet the surface soil of a country, with its usual covering of herbage, may serve to protect the land from degradation, and to check the denuding action which, but for it, would scour the surface after every shower of rain. As instances Professor Prestwich cites 'the position of the many dolmens and other 'so-called "Druidical" stones, so common on the downs of 'this country and in many parts of France.' These show

'that the level of the vegetable soil has undergone little or no change since they were first erected. The camp of Attila, situated in the great chalk plains of Champagne, furnishes a well-known date, namely, A.D. 451. Notwithstanding its more than 1,400 years, the surface of this great earthwork, which is merely covered with a thin growth of grass, remains almost as perfect and as sharp as when first made and grassed over. . . . The many old British and Roman camps in our own country—such, for example, as the large and well-preserved one known as Maiden Castle near Dorchester—attest to the same general fact. But although there is little disturbance of the soil, there has been evidently a removal of the carbonate of lime from the body of these chalk mounds; for it has been redeposited in places among the marble at their base, cementing it into a compact chalk breccia."

A relative permanence also in the conditions of climate is shown by various noteworthy facts. Thus Arago † has made it clear that the mean temperature of Palestine has not undergone any sensible change for more than 3,000 years. The climates of Rome and of the south of France are also sensibly the same as it was in early historical times; for it is well proved that the range of cultivation of the vine and olive still has the same limits as it had in the time of the Romans.

* Notes of a Naturalist on the 'Challenger,' p. 68.

† *Éléments de Physique*, 5th edit. vol. ii. p. 682.

The chapter on ice and ice action contains much deserving attention; but before proceeding to notice its contents, it may be worth while to quote a curious fact communicated to our author by Dr. Rae, the arctic traveller.

'In encamping for the night, in winter, on the shores of a large frozen lake, such as Lake Winnipeg, should the temperature fall rather suddenly ten, fifteen, or twenty degrees (no unusual circumstance), loud cracks, like pistol shots, are heard on the lake. When the party resume their journey over the lake in the morning they usually come to cracks in the ice, sometimes two or more feet wide; in fact, sometimes so wide that it is difficult to jump over them. Should the cold continue for a day or two, these cracks rapidly freeze up. When the temperature rises the ice expands, and as the volume of ice is now too large for the lake by the amount of new ice formed in the cracks, ridges of ice are packed up at certain places, and on the shore. When another cold "snap" comes on, these ridges, as a rule, do not settle down, so fresh cracks are formed; and this process of contraction and expansion goes on for a considerable part of the winter. Even the smallest lakes share this action in a greater or less degree, according to their size, whenever a sudden change of temperature takes place. As a result of this, in many lakelets having stony shores, the stones are wedged and packed together in a manner and with a regularity that resembles the work of man.'

We refer our readers to the book itself for data and graphic statements respecting the origin, dimensions, and movements of glaciers, as well as for a history and analysis of the various theories of glacier motion sketched by Agassiz, Hopkins, Forbes, Tyndall, and Canon Moseley.

As to icebergs, they are stated to vary greatly in their size, rising from 20 to 700, perhaps 1,000 feet above the sea, according to the size of the glacier from which they are derived. A singular example of the transporting power of ice is furnished by an incident which took place a few years since, when the 'Hansa' was abandoned on the east coast of Greenland. A portion of the crew with their boat and goods, the whole forming a considerable cargo, sought refuge on the ice floe. On the breaking up of the ice in the summer, the mass on which they were was carried southwards by the current, and at the end of nine months had drifted to a distance of about 1,300 miles from where they started. By this time the mass of ice was greatly reduced in size, and threatened submergence, when they were fortunately rescued.

From such various effects of cold our author turns, in the next chapter, to considering igneous action as manifested by volcanoes. Therein he explains that view which he himself first promulgated at the meeting of the British

Association held at York, and which he supported by very cogent arguments in a paper read before the Royal Society on April 16, 1885. His general conclusion he states as follows:—

‘As for the primary cause of volcanic eruptions, I think we may look to an independent force arising from the slight shrinking and contraction of the earth’s crust caused by the small but still measurable secular refrigeration, and its consequent pressure upon a viscous or plastic molten layer beneath. That this molten matter is in some places nearer the surface than at others is possible, and that its depth is not great is probable. From time to time a state of tension of the crust finds relief in the extrusion of some of this molten matter, and then follows a state of equilibrium of longer or shorter duration.’

He accepts a calculation (of Cordier) according to which a radial contraction so minute and imperceptible as one millimètre (0·0397 inch) would suffice to supply matter for five hundred of the greatest known volcanic eruptions.

In height these mountains range from 300 or 500 to many thousands of feet. Vesuvius is about 4,000, Etna about 11,000, Cotopaxi (in Peru) 18,876, and Acongagua (in Chili) probably about 23,000. The number of volcanoes in the world may, it appears, be estimated at about five hundred, three hundred being active ones. The streams of lava emitted by these agents are sometimes so vast as at least to bear comparison, however inferior in actual size, with the analogous productions of ancient geological epochs. In the year 1783 the Icelandic volcano called Skapta-Jokul gave forth a lava current which continued to flow for two years. It filled up the beds of rivers to a depth of 600 feet and a breadth of 200, flowing up their channels as well as down, filling deep lakes, and spreading out over wide alluvial plains in burning lakes of fire 12 to 15 miles wide and 100 feet deep. The two principal streams were respectively 40 and 50 miles in length, and from 7 to 15 miles wide, forming a mass said to surpass Mont Blanc in volume. In the island of Hawai a burning deluge of lava broke forth in 1840 from a fissure situated ten miles below the crater of Kilauea. It spread from 1 to 4 miles wide, and reached the sea, at a distance of 30 miles, in three days, and for fourteen days it plunged, in a vast fiery cataract a mile wide, over a precipice 50 feet high. In 1843 a similar stream flowed from the summit of Manna Loai; and in August 1855 the lava broke out at a spot 2,000 feet below the summit on the opposite side of Kilauea, and continued to flow during ten months, overwhelming an area of 200,000 acres. This stream was 60

miles long, from 1 to 10 miles wide, and from 10 to 300 feet deep.

The areas covered by the products of modern volcanoes are very variable, but that of Iceland may be estimated at not more than from 20,000 to 25,000 square miles. Molten lava flows with nearly the liquidity of melted iron or glass. It conducts heat very slowly, so that it forms a solid and very rough crust outside, while the molten stream still continues to flow underneath. At the volcano of Kilauea, the liquidity is so complete that the small jets of lava thrown up in the boiling crater by the escape of vapours, when acted upon by a strong wind, are blown out into fine threads like spun glass, which are called 'Pélé's hair.'

When portions of lava are ejected in a liquid state and fall outside the crater in small fragments, which harden rapidly as they fall, they assume a long globular or pear-shaped form, porous or hollow in the centre, or sometimes inclosing fragments of rock. These more or less spheroidal bodies are known as 'volcanic bombs.'

Lava streams occasionally flow into the sea, and showers of volcanic ashes are often carried by the wind far from land, and then fall into the water, where, after drifting for a time with the currents, they sink and mix with the marine sediments. Mr. Coan states that in one of the eruptions of Kilauea the molten heap of lava which flowed forth into the sea was immediately shattered, like glass, into millions of particles, which were thrown up in clouds that darkened the sky; and the ocean waters were so much heated that the shores became strewn with dead fish for a distance of twenty miles. In the judgement of our author,

'it is probable that Etna first commenced as a submarine volcano, for the lower volcanic rocks alternate with beds containing marine shells, and the area all around is one evidently of recent geological (Pliocene or Pleistocene) elevation. Santorin was also at first a submarine volcano dating back to Pliocene times, and Vesuvius, and possibly Hecla, commenced in the same manner' (p. 207).

With respect to the æriform products of eruption, the vapour of water forms by far the largest part of them, and probably from $\frac{9900}{10000}$ to $\frac{9999}{10000}$ of the whole. M. Fouqué estimated that the quantity of vapour ejected from Etna in the eruption of 1865 amounted to 22,000 cubic metres, or about 5,000,000 gallons daily. As a curious instance of the indirect production of fatal effects of volcanoes through the wonderful expansive power of steam, the following incident may be noted. In 1843 a stream of lava happened, in

flowing by a village on the flanks of Etna, to pass over a cistern of water. This induced an explosion which destroyed the lives of no less than sixty-nine persons.

After treating of volcanoes, Professor Prestwich proceeds to consider the action of earthquakes and the various instances recorded of slow or rapid elevations or depressions of the earth's surface. Closely connected with the latter question is that concerning the origin of coral islands, and to those wonderfully interesting instances of the direct bearing of zoology on geography the author devotes his fourteenth chapter. He carefully and impartially passes in review Darwin's researches and well-known theory, according to which the presence of atolls or of barrier reefs indicates areas of subsidence, and he accords a certain qualified assent thereto. Nevertheless, he observes:—

'More recent observations have shown that the hypothesis of Darwin is not applicable to all coral reefs; and that while it explains the formation of atolls and of many coral islands, it fails to explain that of others, especially those which subtend continental areas. Louis Agassiz some years ago contended that the Florida reefs in particular had distinctive characters which could not be explained by subsidence. He showed that the southern portion of the peninsula of Florida is built of successive concentric barrier reefs, which have been gradually cemented into an extensive land tract by the accumulation and consolidation of sand and silt between the coral growths.'

When the surface of any coral reef, indeed, becomes exposed, it is soon overspread and its interstices filled by small fragments of shells, by coral, sand, and other débris. These materials then become cemented together by the agency of water containing a solution of carbonate of lime, and so a layer of hard limestone is formed which has a slight inclination or 'dip' towards the sea. It is by the formation of such successive outward layers of limestone, aided by the aggregation of sand and silt in the intermediate channels, that the whole of the land of Southern Florida has, in Professor Prestwich's opinion, been built up—land which has a superficial area estimated at not less than 20,000 square miles.

It is very difficult to estimate the age of these extensive coral reefs, as to which only rough approximations can be formed. According to Alexander Agassiz it would probably take from a thousand to twelve hundred years for the corals to grow up to the surface from a depth of seven fathoms. Supposing, then, such a reef to have an average width of half a mile, and to grow laterally four or five times as fast as

its vertical increase, then we should get not less than 20,000 years as the age of its outer portion only.

The area of land has also been increased by the agency of mangrove trees.* The wonderfully complex and tangled roots of these swamp-inhabiting trees tend to arrest the passage of sediment and so to form sandbanks, rising higher and higher, and supporting a more and more elevated growth of vegetation.

Mr. John Murray,† as a result of his observations in H.M.S. 'Challenger,' thinks that coral islands afford evidence of rest, or of elevation, instead of subsidence. He describes the ocean as swarming to a depth of 600 feet with pelagic gasteropods, pteropods, heteropods, cephalopods, fishes, &c., together with calcareous, siliceous, and other algæ, radiolaria, and foraminifera. As these die and fall into deep water, their calcareous skeletons become, during their long downward transit, dissolved by the carbonic acid in solution in the sea water; but not so when they fall on submarine banks a few hundred feet deep, where they lodge and accumulate. Some of the banks may originally have been old volcanic islands worn down by marine denudation. When these foundations are sufficiently raised by the accumulation of this shell débris the corals begin to build, and, owing to the greater supply of food on the outer side of the bank, they there build with great vigour. This, with the heaping up of the dead coral from the outside, and its solution in the interior, gives rise to an atoll with a central lagoon. There is, no doubt, much truth and justice in these statements of Mr. Murray; but, as Professor Prestwich observes, 'it is difficult to explain the peculiar conditions of the coral islands of the Pacific on any other hypothesis than Mr. Darwin's hypothesis, namely, that they indicate areas of slow subsidence.' For these islands are isolated, and have precipitous sides and central lagoons which may be 240 feet deep. In the Pacific there are also many raised islands with massive cliffs of coral limestone from two to three hundred feet high, and which yet rarely, if ever, expose the base of the reef, and so seem clearly to indicate that they have been first slowly formed by an upgrowth—which kept pace with local subsidence—and have since been raised to their present elevation. In some of the West Indian islands there has been elevation of still greater extent, such as that on the

* Professor Le Conte called attention to this agency.

† *Proceed. of the Royal Soc. of Edinburgh*, vol. x. p. 505, 1880.

northern coast of Cuba, where coral reef deposits have been to the height of from 1,000 to 1,100 feet.

As to analogous past conditions, our author observes:—

‘Examples due to the prevalence of the former conditions during certain geological periods are to be found in the widespread coral banks of the coral ray and other Oolitic formations; while the latter conditions may have possibly prevailed, and assisted, in some cases to the building up of some of the thick masses of coral limestones during Palæozoic times. . . . It is certainly singular that in the more recent geological periods we have nothing analogous to the gigantic columns of coral limestone now standing isolated in the depths of the Pacific. Were the Tertiary Seas too shallow, or were the changes of level too frequent or too rapid?’ (P. 247.)

The consideration of this question of geological zoology leads us to notice what we deem the one blemish of an otherwise thoroughly excellent work. We refer to the antiquated and defective zoological classification which Professor Prestwich has adopted and put before us in his fifth chapter. It is true that zoology is not his special province, as also that he guards himself against certain criticisms by saying, what is most true, namely, that ‘it is often expedient for ‘the palæontologist and geologist, who have to work upon a ‘different base, and with imperfect data, to adopt at times a ‘standard somewhat different from that of the professed ‘naturalist and biologist.’ Nevertheless, as a somewhat elaborate classification of animals is presented, we cannot but regret that Professor Prestwich has not availed himself of the aid of one or other of our more advanced biologists.

It is true, indeed, as he says, that ‘the large class of ‘Worms is, with the exception of the Annelids, of no ‘geological importance, as none of the Scolecidæ have been ‘found in a fossil state.’ Nevertheless as the Marsipobranchii are distinctly noticed, we think more than the mere word ‘Pharyngobranchii’ should be given with reference to that very significant type, the Lancelet, and that some reference should have been made to the class Ascidioida, whether or not included in the division of vertebrate animals.

It is also rather a shock to us to encounter the obsolete term ‘Enaliosauria’ as the one only designation for those two very distinct orders of extinct reptiles which include the Ichthyosaurs and Plesiosaurs respectively. But most surprising of all perhaps is it to read as an enumeration of the orders of birds, a list of the most antiquated character, one in which the Ostrich and other struthious birds rank as a mere order, co-ordinate with those now disused ordinal groups formerly

known as 'Grallatores,' 'Natatores,' &c. The two chapters on chemistry, mineralogy, and the composition of rocks are hardly up to date as regards the most modern authorities in these rapidly advancing departments of his subject. Besides these objections, we must also express regret that the work has not been more carefully read for the press. It would be an invidious and unworthy criticism to call attention in detail to mere misprints and errors due to imperfect supervision during publication, but it would be unjust not to affirm that such defects are much too frequent. These defects, however, are, after all, but small blemishes in a work of distinguished merit, which will be deservedly welcomed not only by specialists, but by all readers who take any broad and general interest in questions of science. Besides the chapters the contents of which we have briefly indicated, there are others which treat of disturbed and 'faulted' strata, of cleavage and joints, of mountain ranges, metalliferous deposits, igneous rocks and metamorphism. These are very valuable chapters, dealing as they do with questions to the elucidation of which Professor Prestwich has personally devoted so much study and so many patient observations.

We shall await with eagerness the second volume of this work, which, we anticipate, will be found even more interesting than the first, dealing, as it is intended to do, amongst other things, with the succession of life on the earth, and the evolution of the earth itself.

ART. IX.—1. *Prospectus of the Association for Promoting a Teaching University for London, 1886; and Speeches of Lord Reay, Sir James Paget, Lord Justice Bowen, Lord Justice Fry, Sir Joseph Lister, and others, Members of the Association.*

2. *Higher Schools and Universities in Germany.* By MATTHEW ARNOLD. Second edition. London: 1882.
3. *The German Universities for the last Fifty Years.* By Dr. T. CONRAD. Translated by JOHN HUTCHISON, with a preface by JAMES BRYCE, M.P. Glasgow: 1885.
4. *La Question du Latin.* Par M. RAOUL FRARY. Paris: 1885.

‘**T**HOUGH nothing is or ought to be very interesting at ‘present but Ireland,’ wrote Mr. Brougham to Earl Grey in 1828, ‘I am sure you will be happy to hear how ‘successful the opening of the University of London has ‘been.’ Lord Grey answered, truly and gracefully: ‘To ‘you this must be peculiarly gratifying, for you have been ‘the creator of this establishment, and your name will be ‘for ever united with the improvements which may spring ‘not only from this, but from the rival college, King’s ‘College, London, which never would have existed but for ‘the success of your exertions.’ Our illustrious contributor and the poet Campbell, who assisted him in the London University scheme, had the cordial support of this journal.* Indeed, but that the college in Gower Street was intended to be too strictly secular to admit of so religious a relationship, we might call it our godchild. Those were days of sectarian prejudices and religious tests; and as it was impossible then to procure for the Nonconformists, the Jews, and ‘all ‘sorts and conditions of men,’ admission to Oxford and Cambridge, it seemed to us clear that they ought to be allowed to found a seat of learning, or the nucleus of one, for themselves, and that London was the proper place for this seat of learning. When the Duke of Wellington, as the head of the Church party, brought forward in the same year a scheme for a Church of England College in the Strand, with a chapel and daily services, we supported him as cordially as we had done Lord Brougham.† There were, we thought, enough churchmen in London—parents not

* Edinburgh Review, February 1826, vol. xliii. pp. 315–341.

† Ibid. September 1828, vol. xlvi. pp. 235–258.

sufficiently rich to send their sons, or all their sons, to Oxford or Cambridge—to maintain such a clerical institution.

It seems strange that, whereas tradition ascribes the foundation of Oxford to Alfred, or failing him to Edward the Confessor, and there are authentic charters in existence which prove Cambridge to have been a great school as early as the thirteenth century, there should have been no University of London till the other day. London existed as a city many hundred years before either Oxford or Cambridge was founded. Paris, never a more important place, contained, if not in the time of Charlemagne, at any rate in the twelfth century, a school of the 'totum scibile,' human and divine, out of which sprang that noble University which was throughout the darkness of the Middle Ages as a bright light shining on a hill. In every capital in Europe which is not a mere mushroom, from Vienna to Copenhagen, there is a university with an endless mythical pedigree, and an ascertained longevity of three or four hundred years. Again, there is not, and perhaps there never has been in the world's history, a city more associated than London with poetry, literature, science, and art. Except Oxford and Cambridge, no English provincial town has as yet a name identified with the developement of knowledge or taste. But London, besides being a seat of government not inferior to Rome, has been a shrine of culture only excelled by Athens. It is not a question of how many great English poets, thinkers, lawyers, physicians, divines, philosophers, artists, historians, humourists, have lived, written, taught, and laboured there, but of how few have done so anywhere else in all England. Still, with two unimportant exceptions, the capital, till the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, possessed nothing in the nature of a university. One was the old School of Law, formed out of the Temple with its two societies, Lincoln's Inn, and the lesser affiliated Inns of Court. All were originally in the suburbs. The Temple is full of 'classic green recesses,' and with its fountain, quaint dials, and Elizabethan hall, forms an ideal college. Staple Inn with its gables, Dane's Inn, and the other oases and 'islands of quiet' within a step of Holborn and the Strand, have refectories and butteries. The other was Gresham College. Sir Thomas Gresham intended it to be 'an epitome of a university in London,' and a plan of it exists as it stood in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. It was essentially a collegiate edifice. There was a quadrangular lawn with four paths radiating from the centre to the angles

and fringed with trees. Round this were buildings two stories high, an observatory, a laboratory, and lodgings for seven professors of the best knowledge of the time, 'who were to lecture daily on the 'trivium' and 'quadrivium':

'Lingua, tropus, ratio; numerus, tonus, angulus, astra,'

grammar, logic, and rhetoric; music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. Sir Christopher Wren lectured there to an overflowing audience of merchants who crowded into the theatre at the sound of the bell of the Royal Exchange, and there in the seventeenth century was formed the Royal Society of Great Britain. But the School of Law gave merely a technical education to professional students, and Gresham College never pretended to teach in any strict sense the seven liberal arts or to examine in them at all—two of the functions of a university. However, Tacitus reported eighteen hundred years since that though Londinium was attractive and inspiring—'*loci dulcedo*'—it was '*copia negotiatorum et comœtuum præcipue celebre*,' 'chiefly famous for swarms of traders and vast exports and imports.' So that there is evidence of a corporate tendency in the English capital, as old as Christianity and probably ineradicable, to prefer of the two trade and the things of the body to science and art and the things of the mind and the soul.

Till shortly before Lord Brougham's movement Oxford and Cambridge were probably all that England wanted in the way of universities. Paris herself hardly shone with a brighter light than Oxford during the dark ages, and Cambridge was only a little less famous. French, German, and Italian students flocked to the classes of their monks and schoolmen. These countries and even Spain contained far more universities than England. But quantity and quality do not always go together. The 'twins of learning' generally reflected with sufficient distinctness, if not always in the brightest of mirrors, the characteristic features of contemporary English culture. Their different geniuses, that of Oxford poetical and literary, that of Cambridge practical and scientific, typified later by Mr. Gladstone and Lord Palmerston, were a guarantee against narrowness. Each college was connected with some county or district, of which it educated the gentry and the Anglican clergy, the latter by means of local endowments for poor scholars; and this system made every part of England either dark blue or light blue or a mixture of the two shades.

The two old towns, too, harmonise with the colleges. There are tongues in their stones which speak of a higher intellectual life maintained through all the stages of a metamorphosis of faith and civilisation. A learned and travelled German has said that Nature herself seemed to have created Oxford as the archetype of all university towns, and scholars who have taken a trip to Athens and have imagined with Milton its ancient glories have returned content to the Cambridge of Wordsworth and Tennyson.

In 1886 as in 1828 Ireland is the one absorbing topic of interest. But it is a relief to turn for a moment from the coronation of Mr. Parnell and the attempt to inaugurate a statutory parliament of dynamiters, in order to trace the fortunes of the colleges which owe so much to Lord Brougham. Years before his retirement to Cannes, University College, called in his letter the University of London, and King's College had received charters and had begun to take their share in academical instruction, and, just before his death in 1868, the present University of London, which is an examining and not a teaching body, received the first of the two charters under which it now discharges truly oecumenical functions in Burlington Gardens. It was, however, founded in 1836, so that Lord Brougham, before he sank to rest from his gigantic labours, had seen not one but two institutions spring from that which he actually himself created.

A clever parody of Canning's 'University of Gottingen,' written by Barham, the author of the 'Ingoldsby Legends,' in which each stanza ends with

'The U-
niversity we've got in town,'

is very illustrative of the view at first taken of the London University and colleges. 'Oxford we know, and Cambridge we know, but who are ye?' was a question often put. It was satirically suggested that Sir John Franklin on his return from the Pole should attempt to discover a north-west passage to Gower Street. The college in that unknown region was called a 'godless college,' because, as it was intended for students of all denominations, its authorities thought the better course was not to pretend to teach religion. Both it and the college in the Strand were sneered at as 'joint-stock companies,' a condition really not the fault of the managers, who from the outset would probably not have refused a good legacy or a share in the Government grant for education. Also it was insinuated that, as few of

the students resided within the walls, there were now in London all the materials necessary for the formation of a Latin quarter. But criticism did not kill, rather added life; classes increased and faculties multiplied. A hospital was built in connexion with each college. To this was soon added a preparatory school. Then natural science, eyed askance on the orthodox banks of the Isis and the Cam, was hospitably entertained. Prosaic Gower Street became the site of the first chemical laboratory established in England, and of the first physical laboratory established in London. Professional education was added to the humanities, and instruction was given in civil engineering, architecture, surveying, telegraphy, and other scientific or quasi-scientific modes of earning a livelihood. 'Coaching' classes were formed for the home and Indian Civil Service examinations. Finally some bequests were left to found schools of fine art, and the brand-new science of 'technology' was endowed by the City companies. At present each college, though it has existed barely fifty years, is as important an institution as any one of the Scotch universities, which are comparatively ancient and the creation of a people whose love of learning is proverbial, or as any except a very few of the German universities. There are now about 1,200 students at University College, 800 of whom attend classes in the 'faculties' of arts, science, or law,' or, as statistics show, mainly in classics and mathematics and the other ordinary branches of a liberal education. The remaining 400 are medical students. At King's College the number and distribution are about the same. Among the professors at the two colleges, who are upwards of one hundred strong, are fourteen fellows of the Royal Society, and some of the subjects professed, 'Indo-Chinese philology,' for example, and 'Pali and Buddhist literature,' are in their minute specialism suggestive of Berlin and Heidelberg, while, on the other hand, the chair of 'commerce' and the mention in one of the calendars of a 'workshop superintendent' show an English eye to business. The colleges teach, the University examines—examines, if we are not mistaken, everybody in everything, without regard to age, sex, religion, colour, nationality, or any other mode of classifying mankind. The papers used in Burlington Gardens are set simultaneously, not only at Owens College, Manchester, the Yorkshire College, Leeds, Firth College, Sheffield, and the other colleges, including Roman Catholic Stonyhurst, with which the University has relations, but 'for ladies only' at 'the Ladies' College, Cheltenham,' and

‘from time to time upon the application of the Viceroy of India or the governor of any colony desiring that one or more places in India or such colony may be named as centres for one or more examinations.’ The sun never sets over the British Empire or the papers of the London University. The Oxford or Cambridge student, too, is done with examinations after he takes his Bachelor’s degree. He has merely to pay for his Master’s hood or his Doctor’s gown. But in the University of which Gresham College was to have been an epitome the ‘trivium’ and ‘quadrivium’ need only end with life, and no one can become a master or a doctor of arts, or science, or law, or literature, without giving tangible proof of his accomplishments. Many of those who have done so have risen to the very highest positions. Lord Granville, as Chancellor, not long since pointed with pride to the late Master of the Rolls, Sir George Jessel, and to Sir Farrar Herschell, then Solicitor-General, now Lord Chancellor, as specimens of what the University could do in regard to law; and he might have adduced almost as striking instances in which the verdict of its examiners has been confirmed by distinguished success in medicine, science, and literature. The French encyclopædia, the ‘Dictionnaire Universelle,’ which is usually accurate, is, we regret to say, in error in stating that the University was founded ‘dans l’intérêt politique du parti Whig.’

Brilliant, however, as has been the career of the University and the colleges, certain seekers after perfection are dissatisfied. An association has existed for two years, formed of ‘about 250 members, each of whom was specially invited to join, on the ground of eminence or of experience in matters affecting university teaching in London,’ and called ‘The Association for Promoting a Teaching University for London.’ Its objects are described as follows:—

‘1. The organisation of university teaching in and for London, in the form of a Teaching University, with faculties of Arts, Science, Medicine, and Law.

‘2. The association of university examination with university teaching, and the direction of both by the same authorities.

‘3. The conferring of a substantive voice in the government of the University upon those engaged in the work of university teaching and examination.

‘4. Existing institutions in London of university rank not to be abolished or ignored, but to be taken as the basis or component parts of the University, and either partially or completely incorporated with the minimum of internal changes.

'5. An alliance to be established between the University and the professional corporations, the Council of Legal Education, as representing the Inns of Court, and the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons.'

These views appear to be to some extent shared by two eminent men, Mr. Matthew Arnold, and Professor Seeley of Cambridge. Mr. Matthew Arnold writes in his 'Schools and Universities in Germany: '—

'The University of London labours under a grave defect as an organ of scientific or superior instruction. It gives no instruction at all, but it examines in the different lines of study and gives degrees in them. It has real university examinations which Oxford and Cambridge have not; and these examinations are conducted by an independent board, and not by college tutors. This is excellent; but nevertheless it falls immensely short of what is needed. The idea of a university is that of an institution not only offering to young men facilities for graduating in that line of study to which their aptitudes direct them, but offering to them also facilities for following that line of study systematically under first-rate instruction. This second function is of incalculable importance; of far greater importance than the first. . . . The University of London should be recast, and should have faculties formed in connexion with it, in order to give some voice and place to superior instruction in the richest capital in the world; and for this purpose the strangely devised and anomalous organisations of King's College and University College should be turned to account and *co-ordered*, as the French say, with the University of London. Contributions from Oxford and Cambridge and new appointments might supply what was wanting to fill the faculties, which in London, the capital of the country, should, as at Paris or Berlin, be very strong. London would then really have what it has not as yet, a University.'

And Mr. Seeley says in 'Essays on a Liberal Education: '—

'Education in England is what the universities choose to make it. This seems to me too great a power to be possessed by two corporations, however venerable and illustrious. I wish we had several more universities; I mean teaching as well as examining universities.'

A still more distinguished person, Dr. Newman, had in some respects anticipated these opinions. He said to a Catholic audience in 1854: *—

'I protest to you, gentlemen, that if I had to choose between a so-called university which dispensed with residence and tutorial superintendence, and gave its degrees to any person who passed an examination in a wide range of subjects, and a university which had no professors or examiners at all, but merely—as I believe Oxford did in the last century—brought a number of young men together for

* Office and Work of Universities, 'Historical Sketches,' vol. i.

three or for years and then sent them away—if I were asked which of these two methods was the better discipline of the intellect, which would produce better public men, men of the world, men whose names would descend to posterity, I have no hesitation in giving the preference to that university which did nothing over that which exacted of its members an acquaintance with every science under the sun.'

The scheme of the London confederates, therefore, is not new and could not be patented. Mr. Arnold does not approve of either their second or their third object. He thinks 'an independent board,' as supplied by the University of London, a better examining body than the 'college 'tutors' and professors who wish for 'a substantive voice.' As to Professor Seeley, he has already seen 'several more 'universities, teaching as well as examining universities,' founded—the Victoria University with branches in Liverpool and Manchester, and a power to grant degrees; the University College of Wales, with a calendar commemorating the deaths of Owen Glendower, 'Huw Morus the poet,' 'Prince Rhys ap Gruffydd,' 'Tanan Glan Glirionydd,' 'Dafydd Ddu 'o Enyri,' and other exercises in spelling and pronunciation; the Firth College at Sheffield; and the University Colleges at Leeds and Birmingham. These institutions probably are, or will soon be, as useful as most of the German universities. India and the colonies also have not only the perpetual examinations, whose headquarters is in Burlington Gardens, but 'teaching universities' everywhere, in the quarters of the primitive Aryan civilisation, in those in which we come into contact with the institutions of the French, the Spanish, and the Dutch, and in 'Oceana,' which is England under other constellations. Cardinal Newman would probably prefer Oxford, with that historical emblem of 'much snapdragon 'growing on the walls opposite my freshman's rooms,' to anything either in London, or elsewhere in the English provinces, or in Wales, or in the East or West Indies, or even in 'Oceana.' But his description of Oxford in the last century, when Gibbon went to Bath without an *exeat* in term time, and Johnson used to 'slide in Christchurch meadows' during the lecture hour, is too true, and, according to Gray's letters, applies equally to Cambridge.

An obvious criticism on this scheme is that a 'Teaching University of London' already exists. University and King's Colleges are not castles of the imagination, and each is a 'teaching university' as much as Bonn or St. Andrews. We interpret the 'office,' to use Cardinal Newman's phrase, of a university as threefold—to educate

students, to grant degrees, to be a seat of learning. King's College and University College do not grant degrees, and, though many of their professorships are held by learned men, we consider that they do more for education, strictly speaking, than for scholarship or scientific research. But what is the view taken by the Senate of London University? Is the 'independent board of examiners' reconciled to suicide or to sinking its individuality in a congeries of everything that is academical in London? Its degrees, it must be recollected, have an established commercial value. Again, have the Inns of Courts been consulted? They are bodies not without '*vis inertiae*.' And what about the Incorporated Law Society? The Inns and the Society too are rather professional than academical corporations. They deal with a business, not with culture. And this is equally true of the College of Physicians and the College of Surgeons. Finally, what precisely are 'the existing institutions of 'university rank' in London which the all-embracing London University of the future is to associate with itself? Does it aim at the curatorships at the British Museum, the teacher-ships at South Kensington, the professorships at the School of Mines? The part of the catalogue of one of these institutions which deals with 'Academies, London,' is of some length. Then all these bodies have charters, changes in which involve Acts of Parliament, and there are vested interests which will claim consideration. The task which the illuminated band have set themselves is vastly more complicated than that undertaken half a century ago by Lord Brougham and Campbell. These fifty years have, however, seen much 'co-ordering' in matters of education. Primary education is now compulsory. Oxford and Cambridge have been reformed by Royal Commissions, and have been modernised by the sweeping away first of their county connexions and then of celibacy, and voluntarily through their 'local examinations,' their inspections of schools, and their 'university extension' lectures in the great towns—those in London owe, we believe, much to the fostering care of Mr. Göschel—they control not only, as they from time immemorial have done, the studies of the public schools, but those of the endowed grammar schools and the more modern 'colleges' and seminaries of all descriptions at which the children of the less wealthy are trained; and Mr. Seeley would, we are sure, not deny that this extended influence is, after all, good for culture. Then in the London University with its 'real examinations' Oxford and Cambridge have found a

keen rival. Mr. Matthew Arnold's own 'Schools and Universities of Germany,' too, and his 'French Eton,' and the volume of essays to which Mr. Seeley has contributed, mark an anxiety on the part of those responsible for English education to accept hints from abroad, especially from Germany, the land of professors, and a determination to deal with the question in a philosophical spirit. We have been travelling fast in the direction of 'sweetness and light.'

The difficulties, however, of the scheme have not escaped those who have put it forward. Lord Reay, who was chairman of the Association till he became Governor of Bombay, and who has done much for the organisation of education in Holland, clearly by his speeches felt that he had taken a heavy task in hand; and the reports of the committees have been several times 'received but not adopted' by the general body. He speaks, as a practical man would, of the project as 'a very intricate and complicated problem.' But the action of the bodies which it is sought to 'co-order' has been, on the whole, singularly favourable. We think University College and King's College most important, because the examinations of the University of London are sure to continue, whether its constitution be or be not altered, and the professional corporations can always rely on the self-interest of their members and on that of the public, which depends upon them for health and skilled assistance at every turn. The staffs of the two colleges are unanimously in favour of Lord Reay's programme. But some allowance ought probably to be made for the desire to remove the one disability under which they labour as compared with the Scotch and German universities, and, since the recent charter, with the Victoria University in the North, that they do not grant degrees. All similar institutions except King's and University Colleges dispense titles as well as education, and the professors would no doubt contend that the titles add a market value to the instruction. Their pupils, however, actually take perhaps half the degrees which are granted annually by the London University, and, besides, often afterwards graduate at Oxford and Cambridge. University College trained the several Nonconformist senior wranglers and the one Jewish senior wrangler whose exclusion from fellowships did so much to abolish tests. The number and distinction of Lord Reay's adherents among the medical profession are also remarkable. Sir James Paget, Sir Andrew Clark, Sir Joseph Lister, Mr. Erichsen, and many physicians and surgeons only less famous, belong to the Association.

For some reason the examinations of the medical faculty in the University of London are not popular. At one of the meetings a graduate is reported to have said that 'the University of London was simply a blight upon the medical schools in London.' Such strong language, if by any means justifiable, reveals a state of things which would have been mortifying to Lord Brougham, who looked for great results from the medical school of University College, out of which the faculty sprang. The fact appears to be that while the London hospitals—Guy's, St. Bartholomew's, and the rest, some as old as the sixteenth century—form collectively as great a school of medicine and surgery, with as accomplished a staff of professors and demonstrators, as exists, the medical faculty of the London University grants degrees to but a few of the London students. For whatever reason, perhaps because its professional standard is pedantically high, perhaps because of the rigour of the general training exacted as a preliminary, the London students to whom it is an object to become Bachelors and Doctors of Medicine prefer, while they are walking the London hospitals, to qualify, at no small additional expense, at Dublin or a Scotch university. As to law, Lord Justice Bowen is reported to have 'pointed out' at a 'private conference' that

'under any circumstances the Inns of Court must remain the local centre of legal education; that the practical part, as in the case of medicine, must remain much as at present; and that there would be difficulties in carrying out any scheme which interfered with the powers and functions of the Benchers of the Inns of Court. But, outside this province, there remained an unsupplied want, of a Faculty or School of Law, analogous to the theoretic side of medical education. For this, London was the proper home, and a teaching university, such as was proposed, might be expected to call it into existence.'

The present Lord Chancellor concurred in these observations, and so will the whole profession of which he and Lord Justice Bowen are ornaments. The business of a barrister is only to be learned in chambers and in court, and the 'theoretic side' is for 'jurists' who have been defined as 'gentlemen who are not lawyers;' but it happens that, since the report of the Inns of Court Commission, these not very practical gentlemen, and among them one theorist of the highest distinction, Sir Henry Maine, have been provided with a congenial occupation in the Temple. Lord Reay has also met with a certain sympathy among persons connected with other, as he would put it, 'disjecta membra univer-

‘sitatis’ which are to be found in many quarters of our huge capital.

‘It has,’ he says, ‘the very best science and art collections, and libraries, the *personnel* and the arsenal for an ideal university, and for the highest form of research which ought always to accompany the highest form of teaching. . . . No institution which is doing the work of university education in London will be interfered with. A federation of institutions which would have by the very fact of their federation increased power for good is what is aimed at.’

Here Lord Reay is not very definite. We scarcely understand how the ‘power for good’ of the School of Music would be increased by ‘federation’ with the Society of Engineers, or how the Incorporated Law Society would be improved by intimate relations with the South Kensington Museum. Lord Walsingham, however, one of the trustees of the British Museum, and Mr. Newton, one of its curators and the author of some admirable lectures on recent Greek excavations, have given some countenance to the scheme; and Professor Huxley, the President of the Royal Society, no doubt because he thinks that it will, on the whole, advance the cause of science, is a member of the Association. It is a most distinguished and representative body, such as Lord Reay may well be proud to have collected round him, and the equal of which could not, we believe, be formed anywhere in Europe except in Berlin or Paris.

By a coincidence two books have just been published, one in Paris, ‘*La Question du Latin*,’ the other in Berlin, ‘*The German Universities for the last Fifty Years*,’ a mass of statistics skilfully arranged by Dr. Conrad, which may assist the Association. In France and Germany, even more than in England, there is a recurring tendency to question the title of the classics to the first place in liberal education, which science and the modern languages are always ready to dispute. ‘*La Question du Latin*’ is a French contribution to this controversy, and so to some extent is Dr. Conrad’s treatise. It appears that twice in the last quarter of a century (in 1869 and in 1880) the opinion of the Berlin Faculty of Philosophy, which contains men illustrious in the most diverse branches of letters and science, has been taken with the result of a unanimous verdict in favour of the classics.* These are the words of Dr. Hofmann, the

* We give the names. In 1869, Curtius, Haupt, Müllenhoff, Kirchhoff, Dove, Trendelenburg, Rödiger, M. Ohm, G. Rosa, Droysen, Weierstrass, Von Raumer, Magnus, Kümmer, Weber, Harms, Beyrich,

professor of chemistry at Berlin: 'All efforts to find a substitute for the classical languages, whether in mathematics, in the modern languages, or in the natural sciences, have been hitherto unsuccessful. After long and vain search we must always come back to the results of centuries of experience; that the surest instrument that can be used in training the mind of youth is given us in the study of the languages, the literature, and the works of art of classical antiquity.' In France after the Franco-German war the Government course of higher education, in which the classics held a good though not so prominent a position as in England, was attacked as one of the causes of the national disasters. A law of 1880, for which M. Jules Simon was to some extent responsible, introduced a time table of studies by which the classics were deposed, the statutable hours a week becoming 'for French 51, for Latin 39, for Greek 20, for German or English 33, for science 38, for history and geography 36.' The results are most unsatisfactory. The Faculty of Letters at Paris now reports that '*la culture générale est en pleine décadence*,' and the professors at the Lycées, with the connivance of the State inspectors, are breaking the law and reverting to the old system. The cry is 'The students know perhaps a larger number of facts, but they have less well-developed minds.' France and Germany are for once at one, the only dissentient being, as we learn from an amusing note of Dr. Conrad's, Prince Bismarck, who, when asked to give an opinion, replied: 'I think Russian, with its twenty-four conjugations, might well be admitted as a substitute for Latin. It would have the additional advantage that it would prove useful in the event of war.' But even Prince Bismarck's influence with his countrymen is not likely to dethrone the

W. Peters, Mommsen, A. Braun, E. Helwing. In 1880, Droysen, Kümmer, Zeller, Helmholtz, Lepsius, Mommsen, G. Kirchhoff, Müllenhoff, Curtius, Vahlen, Peters, Harms, Nitzsch, Wattenbach, Schrader, A. W. Hofmann, Weierstrass, Beyrich, A. Kirchhoff, Wagner, Von Treitschke, Weber, Schwenderer, Scherer, Hübner, Tobler, Eichler, Sachan, Grimm, Schmidt, Kiepert, Websky, Rammelsberg, Foerster, Zupitza, Robert. The 'faculty of philosophy' at Berlin includes chairs not only of Greek and Latin, and every branch of classical archaeology, but of the Oriental languages, ancient and modern history, modern languages, all branches of mathematics, physical science, and mental and moral philosophy. It includes the faculties of (1) arts, i.e. classics and mathematics, (2) science, (3) literature at the present (examining) University of London.

great German potentate *Alterthumswissenschaft*—the systematic knowledge of classical antiquity.

The conception of university education formed by the French and German writers seems to us clearer than that indicated in the prospectus; though this is perhaps due to the centralisation and perpetual intervention of the State, to which in matters of education, as in others, Frenchmen and Germans are subjected. The omnipresent earthly Providence and drill sergeant imparts striking roundness and neatness to the ideas of the governed. They would tell Lord Reay, as we have suggested, that the institutions which are sought to be 'federated' are different in species and impossible to combine. A German professor goes out of his senses at the thought of any union of *Geist*, culture, with *Brotwissenschaft*, the various means of honestly earning one's bread. Illicit intercourse of this kind is in his eyes the death of the genuine scientific spirit, and also of education in so far as a university has to do with education. Now, no doubt, true culture, and English culture which we prefer to German, has many palaces and still more humble homes in London, more of the latter naturally than in any place in England; but academical culture in the received sense has three residences only, University College, King's College, and Burlington Gardens, when the Senate of the London University is sitting, or the encyclopædic questions are being answered. The other institutions to which invitations have been sent represent professions, or, if the City and Guilds of London Technical Institute, of which we observe that the 'director,' Mr. Magnus, supports Lord Reay, be included, trades and handicrafts, 'bread studies' as a German professor would scornfully describe them. True, the colleges have sometimes had to unbend. Importunate parents have insisted on special preparation for the Home and Indian Civil Service examinations, and a professional school of candidates for orders has been instituted at King's College, owing to its close relations with the Church of England. But their real business, as much as that of Oxford and Cambridge, is academical culture, that is, classics or mathematics, or a combination of the two, according to the aptitudes of the students. The 'workshop' is a phantom. The chair of 'commerce' is unreal, though there is an analogue in the lectureship in German 'shorthand' in the Berlin course. Architecture, surveying, telegraphy, are only advertisements. Professions and businesses, except indeed those of professors and teachers, cannot be taught or learned at uni-

versities. They plough, harrow, and enrich the soil, but it is not for them to sow the seed. Socrates lectured on ideal beauty, and left it to Phidias to translate the lessons into the friezes of the Parthenon. There is thus a gulf, over which it is difficult to find a bridge, between the University and King's Colleges and the Inns of Court and the Incorporated Law Society, which form the licensing authority of the legal profession, and the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons, which hold the same position as regards the medical. There can scarcely be a closer alliance than exists between Oxford and Cambridge and these professional corporations. And there is the same interval as regards the Society of Architects, the Society of Engineers, and the other bodies which grant certificates of practical capacity, the Royal Academy, and the School of Fine Art at South Kensington, and the multitudinous industries of which a microcosm exists in the Technical Institute recently founded by the Companies and the Corporation. We gladly admit, however, that the more our 'bread students' are endowed with *Geist*, whether they are to be lawyers, or doctors, or artists, or artisans, the better it will be for their own minds, and in some degree for their studies. Genius, industry, and technical skill are the essentials, but culture is a useful addition, or at any rate an ornamental one. Any extension, therefore, of the work of the University and King's Colleges which will add to the percentage of cultivated English gentlemen and gentlewomen within the bills of mortality ought to be welcomed, and so ought any diffusion of the elevating influence of the National Gallery and the wonderful treasures in the British Museum.

There is food for reflection in Dr. Conrad's statistics. Germany is, of course, very unlike England. It will be some time before professors are as honoured here as there. There is something to us inadequate in a life spent in passing the dust of some obscure corner of science or history through sieve after sieve. Our young men of promise prefer the keen rivalry of the learned professions or the chances of literature or journalism, or else they go to the colonies to try their luck, or to India as civil servants. But making every allowance, if there is anything in numbers, we are more behind Germany than we should be, considering our wealth and the extent of our endowments. The population of Germany is about forty-five, that of Great Britain and Ireland about thirty-five millions. Germany has twenty-one universities, the United Kingdom thirteen, or, if University and King's Colleges and the new colleges in the provinces

and Ireland 'of university rank' are included, about the same number as Germany. But there is a want of system in our distribution, and the number of students is less in proportion. In Germany a university is as much a matter of course in a large city as a townhall in England. In Germany, again, there are probably 25,000, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, there can scarcely be more than 10,000 students. And Scotland, for whatever reason, is the only part of the United Kingdom in which the love of learning has penetrated to the lower middle class as in Germany. Here, for instance, is Dr. Conrad's classification of the 'occupations and social position of the fathers of the German students' at Halle: '(1) professions, (2) lower officials and elementary schoolmasters, (3) merchants, manufacturers, hotelkeepers, landed proprietors, officers, apothecaries, fundholders, (4) artisans and peasants, (5) inferior servants and labourers.' The number of 'inferior servants and labourers' is small, smaller probably than in Scotland, but that of the 'artisans and peasants' is very considerable indeed; and we should like to know how many elementary schoolmasters or apothecaries there are in London who have sons at University or King's College. University education, too, in Germany, is incomparably cheaper than in England. The cost for 1882-83 of the education of 25,000 students is thus given:—

'State grant, excluding extraordinary expenditure on buildings, laboratories, &c., 295,661*l.*, or 24*l.* 3*s.* per student; including this extraordinary expenditure, 379,651*l.*, or 31*l.* *Students' fees*, 36,430*l.*, or about 1*l.* 10*s.* per student. . . . *The main burden for the parents lies in the maintenance of the students*, and in a very large number of cases (as doubtless among "artisans and peasants" and even "elementary schoolmasters") this is always heavy enough.'

At Oxford and Cambridge, with endowments amounting to double the German State grant, the fees can scarcely be less than 30*l.*, and the total expenses of an undergraduate are seldom under 200*l.* a year. At the London colleges, which have a mere apology for an endowment and no State grant, the fees amount to about 40*l.* a year. Many of the students live with their families; those who have not this advantage can probably go through the course on about 100*l.* or 120*l.* a year with strict economy. Practically, therefore, unless a young Englishman can partly support himself by scholarships and exhibitions, his father cannot think of Oxford or Cambridge for him unless he has about 1,000*l.* a year, and even University and King's Colleges are

closed against the sons of all but tolerably well-to-do Londoners. The clerks and tradesmen whom it is the fashion to taunt as 'Philistines' cannot find a way out of Gath for their children. This inequality of opportunities may be inevitable or of less importance than we are inclined to attribute to it, considering the formidable competitors that we are now finding the Germans in business both in London and the great manufacturing towns as well as in many colonial and foreign markets, but there is no good in ignoring it, and we should prefer to see it rectified.

The prospectus is silent as to endowment and buildings, neither of which is an unusual element in the constitution of a university. Perhaps Lord Reay and his colleagues have used a wise discretion, as times are undoubtedly bad. We think they have not much to hope from the State, though the temper of the new House of Commons on such subjects has yet to be tested. It contains, however, an increased number of members who probably prefer a good leading article to all Thucydides. On the other hand, Mr. Arnold has long been crying in the wilderness for State interference at stages subsequent to the primary school; and there are those who see not only in the rise of German commerce, but in the German military successes, the results of organised education. Science too, well as she has prospered among us without subvention, is apt to hint that there are experiments too costly and expeditions into new realms too distant for private capital and private enterprise. And the influence of the local examinations and of the London University, at which many of the Nonconformist clergy now obtain degrees, has set at any rate a little leaven at work among the classes which would most directly benefit by State aid. Also there are precedents. The Scotch universities, which, though ancient, are poorly endowed, receive annually from the Government the sum of 18,992*l.* for the purpose of augmenting the salaries of the professors. The universities and colleges of Ireland receive a Government grant of 25,836*l.*; and Royal Commissions, the advice of which is, however, not always followed, have reported favourably to the principle. The 'Commission on Higher and 'Intermediate Education in Wales' recommended an annual grant of 8,000*l.* a year to the new University College of Wales. Indeed, the Royal Commissioners on Scientific Education say in their fifth report, which was issued in 1874:—

'After carefully reviewing the evidence laid before them with regard to *University College and King's College*, the Commissioners are of

opinion that they have established a claim to the aid of Government which ought to be admitted ;'

and add :—

'We think that such Government aid should be afforded both in the form of a capital sum, to enable the colleges to extend their buildings when requisite, and to provide the additional appliances for teaching which the advance of scientific education has now rendered absolutely necessary ; and also in the form of an annual grant in aid of the working expenses of the colleges.'

But Ireland is always suing for money *in formâ pauperis*, and the Scotch estimates are to a great extent in the hands of the Scotch members. A scheme for the benefit of London would have to be discussed strictly on its merits, and it would be difficult to contend that education is doomed to starve in London without alms from the country. In Glasgow, not long since, 260,000*l.* was raised for new university buildings. The colleges in Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Sheffield, to which we have alluded, and those recently founded in Birmingham, Newcastle, Bristol, and Nottingham, have no State endowment. Across the Atlantic the Harvard and John Hopkins Universities bear the names of patriots and lovers of learning who headed a subscription. It may well be urged that the oldest, greatest, and wealthiest of cities ought to be able to endow her own university. At certain times and in certain places, and by persons from whom we should have expected better things, it has been suggested that the scheme offers a convenient pretext for robbing the City companies in order to erect a grand mausoleum in their honour ; but as regards this suggestion we have already taken our stand on the eighth commandment. We believe, however, that Sir Robert Fowler, during his mayoralty, entertained some of Lord Reay's associates and had the project explained to him, and we recollect a meeting at the Mansion House in favour of establishing a British Institute at Athens, at which Professor Jebb, the biographer of Bentley, said :—

'A man who gave 20,000*l.* to found a British School of Classical Studies at Athens would have secured a place of unique honour in the regard of all for whom the study of the past has anywhere a charm or a meaning, and would have perpetuated his name, both at home and in Greece, by a living monument of the most splendid and enduring kind. It is quite certain that a new and distinguished part might be played by the man of wealth who had sufficient originality and insight to perceive the real opportunities of a Victorian Mæcenas.'

We think a Victorian Mæcenas would do even more good by

bestowing a sum of 20,000*l.* on University College or King's College. At present the professors at these institutions are bridegrooms of poverty who would have done credit to the early Benedictine order. Even in the most popular faculties it is difficult to earn an income of 400*l.*, and retiring pensions are out of the question. This is hard treatment, and it cannot be soothing to know that at Manchester and Liverpool men of not more than equal ability have this maximum sum secured to them, by private benefactions, as a nest egg, while in Scotland the teachers most in request earn, between endowments and fees, sums of 1,500*l.* or even 2,000*l.* a year. The smallness of the incomes of the London colleges accounts also for the rather high price of the education which they give, and thus for the limited character of their work and influence. The population of London is larger than that of Scotland, but the Scotch universities educate twice as many students as the London colleges. If the fees at the latter could be lowered, or if 'bursaries' could be established, small scholarships sufficient to pay the fees, such as have long assisted the 'nationes' north of the Tweed to cultivate the humanities on a little oatmeal, we should hope to see more branches distributed over the vast area, better attended classes, and as a consequence a higher standard of taste among ordinary Londoners.

The question of buildings, which, however, did not escape the Commissioners on Scientific Education, is apparently postponed. A board of delegates can, of course, meet in Burlington Gardens, or in a spare room, if there be one, in Gower Street or the Strand, and the bodies which it is sought to combine have mostly local habitations. There are few boarders at present at the London colleges. Two small hostels suffice for their accommodation. Medical students and law students are of an age at which collegiate discipline is supposed to be out of place. But if, in the course of the growth which many hope to see, the London colleges should attract to them a crowd of young men whose parents do not live in London, we confess that for obvious reasons we should prefer for such youths a common life under tutorial supervision to one spent *sui juris* in lodgings. The colleges of Oxford and Cambridge are, apart from their studies and games, shadows of home. Cardinal Newman* puts this in his own exquisite way:—

* Office and Work of Universities, 'Historical Sketches,' vol. i. p. 214.

'This view of a college, which I have not been attempting to prove but to delineate, suggests to us the objects which a college is adapted to fulfil in a university. It is all and does all which is implied in the name of home. Youths who have left the paternal roof and travelled some hundreds of miles for the acquisition of knowledge find an "altera Troja" and "simulata Pergama" at the end of their journey, and in their place of temporary sojourn. Home is for the young, who know nothing of the world, and who would be forlorn and sad if thrown upon it. It is the refuge of helpless boyhood, which would be famished and pine away if it were not maintained by others. It is the providential shelter of the weak and inexperienced, who have still to learn how to cope with the temptations which lie outside of it. It is the place of training for those who are not only ignorant, but have not yet learned how to learn, and who have to be taught by careful individual trial how to set about profiting by the lessons of a teacher. And it is the school of elementary studies, not of advanced; for such studies alone can boys apprehend and master. Moreover, it is the shrine of our best affections, the bosom of our fondest recollections, a spell upon our after life, a stay for the world-weary mind and soul, wherever we are cast, till the end comes. Such are the attributes or offices of home; and like to these, in one or other sense and measure, are the attributes and offices of a college in a university.'

And of all the 'higher schools and universities' which Mr. Arnold describes in Germany we confess to, and he shares, an English preference for the college of Schulpforta.

'No *Alumnat*,' he says, 'in Prussia or indeed in Germany can compare with Schulpforta, which by its antiquity, its beauty, its wealth, its celebrity, is entitled to vie with the most renowned English schools. The Cistercian abbey of St. Mary's, Pforta, dates from 1137. It was secularised in 1540; and Duke Maurice of Saxony in 1543 established in its place and endowed with its revenues a Protestant school for 100 scholars. It stands near the Saal, in the pleasant country of Prussian Saxony; and the venerable pile of buildings rising among its meadows, hills, and woods, is worthy of the motto borne on the arms of the old abbey: "Hier ist nichts anderes denn Gottes Haus, und hier die Pforte des Himmels" ("This is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate—porta, Pforte—of Heaven." Gen. xxviii. 17). It has a beautifully restored chapel, regular commemorative services, and a host of local usages. A Latin grace is sung in hall every day before dinner by the whole body of scholars. Every scholar has by ancient institution his *tutor*, every master his *famulus*. This is the German school where Latin verse has been most cultivated, and the *Musæ Portenses*, like those of Eton, have been published. . . . Grævius, Ernesti, Klopstock, Büttiger, Mitscherlich, Fichte, Dissen, Thiersch, Spitzner, Döderlein, Spohr, were all educated here.'

The passage calls to mind the beautiful elegiacs, translated by the late Lord Derby, in which the Marquis of

Wellesley, 'long tost on fortune's waves,' bequeaths to Eton his 'aged dust.'* It is impossible, however, nowadays to have in the heart of London a college like Oriel, or Eton, or Schulpforta. 'Exports and imports' have edged Tacitus's 'loci dulcedo' into the suburbs, and education, if it is to be in accordance with the best English traditions, must follow and go out of town. The Charterhouse and Merchant Taylors' School have already done so. The original 'Quartier Latin' was the 'Pratum' of Alcuin, stretching along the south bank of the Seine, the name of which survives in that of the Abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés. The great university was in the Middle Ages a wholesome *rus in urbe*. The students took their walks among vineyards and gardens. If, instead of laying the blame on the classics, the French Republic could remove its young barbarians out of the reach of the temptations of Paris, and in a paroxysm of Anglomania naturalise the foreign institution of proctors, it might rear a generation of citizens more qualified than the present 'to serve God in Church and State.'

The success of the Technical College—that handsome red-brick building near the Albert Hall—may well embolden the projectors of this scheme.† 'Technology' thirteen years ago was a Swiss or German article. We were the greatest manufacturing nation in the world, and perhaps the most inventive, but we had fallen into a bad habit of depending too exclusively on our coal and iron, and bestowing too little thought on the applied sciences which enable us to extract money from them. In 1873 the Clothworkers' Company founded a school for the promotion of textile industries on scientific principles in connexion with the Yorkshire College, the college which we have mentioned, at Leeds. This was the small beginning. In 1875 Mr. Gladstone made one of his eloquent speeches in which he said that it was 'especially

-
- * 'Fortunæ rerumque vagis exercitus undis,
 In gremium redeo, serus, Etona, tuum.
 Magna sequi, et summæ mirari culmina famæ,
 Et purum antiquæ lucis adire jubar,
 Auspice te didici puer; atque in limine vitæ
 Ingenuas veræ laudis amare vias.
 Siqua meum vitæ decursæ gloria nomen
 Auxerit, aut aliquis nobilitarit honor,
 Muneris, alma, tui est. Altrix da terra sepulcrum,
 Supremam lacrimam da, memoremque mei.'

† See 'Edinburgh Review,' April 1868, vol. cxxvii., 'Technical and Scientific Education.'

'desirable that efforts should be made to give instruction in science so as to improve the knowledge of the British artist and workman and enable him to hold his position in the markets of the world.' The seed fell on a rich soil; others of the London companies came forward. They thought of the emblems in their arms, of the ship in the Mercers' crest, of the camel laden with spices which marks the Grocers', and the bales of wool which mark the Drapers' ancient connexion with commerce and industry. They found that the St. Gothard tunnel and the splendid bridges which span the Rhine and the Moselle were the work of persevering German artisans carefully trained in 'technology,' and that Swiss artisans better grounded than ours in chemistry were beating us in the manufacture of colours. They determined that, if money could buy the proper instruction, England should no longer be at a disadvantage. The result has been the foundation and endowment at a vast expense of this 'City and Guilds Technical Institute,' of Finsbury Technical College, of technical professorships at the London colleges, of technical schools at Manchester, Nottingham, Middlesbrough, Sheffield, Leicester, Bolton, Bradford, and other provincial towns, and of a system of technical examinations which for range of the practical acquirements tested may be compared to the subdivisions of science and letters which are examined in by the University of London. Zurich and Hanover are, it is said, fast becoming envious. And this work has not cost the State a penny; but the practical necessity for it had become obvious, as obvious as, when admitted, was its claim on the resources of these stately corporations.

We have, we trust, sufficiently expressed our sympathy with the more practical part of the movement in favour of a 'Teaching University' of London. We look for good results from the colleges which, under the influence of the same ideas, have been established and liberally endowed in the great provincial towns. We hope to see Liverpool* and

* The Senate of University College, Liverpool, has just taken the very practical step of arranging a special course of study for young men preparing for a business life. They are to enter at sixteen, and are to pursue their studies for two years at an expense to their parents of from 20*l.* to 27*l.* a year. It is a remarkable and most encouraging fact that this scheme is receiving energetic support from more than 250 companies and firms in the great port, many of them bearing names honourably associated with the best traditions of English commerce and enterprise.

Manchester forgetting for a moment the ship canal and the 'corner' in the cotton trade in order to hear Ritschl's last word on Latin inscriptions. Culture has more friends there than in America, but they have not had a Harvard or a Yale to act as a loadstone to bring them together, like the brilliant society which hung round Emerson. The task of the 'Teaching University' of London must be different. Its professors will rarely be the leaders of society. But they may bring the higher kinds of learning within the reach of a larger number of novices than has often been initiated. Who knows also but that they may add to the sum of knowledge and cause their countrymen to value more highly a life of humble devotion to its acquirement? Between Oxford and Cambridge and the new institution, should Lord Reay's dream be realised, there need be no jealousy. The old universities will always hold their own. A fire may come out of the bramble, but it will not, as in Jotham's parable, consume the cedars of Lebanon.

ART. X.—1. *Œuvres choisies de A. J. Letronne*. Edites par E. FAGNAN. Vol. ii. Paris: 1881.

2. *Modern Egypt and Thebes*. By Sir GARDNER WILKINSON. 2 vols. London: 1843.

3. *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum*. Edidit AUG. BOECKH. Vol. iii. Berlin: 1853.

4. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Edidit THEOD. MOMMSEN. Vol. iii. pars 1. Berlin: 1863.

LONG before the dahabeah enters upon the great sweep of river that skirts the pylons of Karnak, the traveller has strained his eye to discover whatever traces may be visible of the once mighty city, the metropolis of an empire, and the mausoleum of its kings—Egyptian Thebes. How much or how little will be remaining of the hundred temple-towers, the shrines and statues and obelisks without number, the avenues of sphinxes, the princely palaces and fortresses, the sculptured courts and colonnades? On the eastern bank the ruins of Karnak stand up in solid and monumental grandeur; but on the western the eye wanders over the level expanse that stretches to the foot of the hills, without at first encountering more than a few confused heaps or mounds, scarcely distinguishable from the sand which surrounds them. Presently, however, our gaze is arrested by

two dark objects, situated at a greater distance from the river than the ruins already observed, and differing from them both in appearance and elevation. They seem to rise up like twin martellos or watch towers from the desert, and to stand apart in melancholy solitude. The spectacle is strange and puzzling, and for a moment our imagination is at a loss for a key. Suddenly it flashes upon us that the two mysterious objects which have excited our astonishment are none other than the famed Colossi of Thebes—the Vocal Memnon and his mute companion.

A walk of a little over a mile from the river bank brings us to the base of the statues. As we approach them through the allotments of clover and maize, they loom up higher and higher, until, as we stand at their feet, their stupendous shapes almost exclude the sky. Placed on the very fringe of the cultivated soil, where the furthest Nile deposit is cut short by the first wave of sand, they stand between the dead and the living, and seem like two grim sentinels stationed to guard the entrance to the desert behind. At other times, when the inundations are abroad and the surrounding country is turned into a sea, they tower with an even greater solemnity above the waters. The Nile stretches in an unbroken level from its own channel till it washes their pedestals and laves their massive feet. How vividly do we realise the prophet's description of 'populous No, that 'was situate among the rivers, that had the waters round 'about it, whose rampart was the sea, and her wall was 'from the sea'!* It is under these conditions and at sunset that the pair should be seen. Then, as the glowing disc sinks behind the hills that inclose the Valley of the Tombs of the Kings and the dwindling radiance of the heavens is repeated in the mirror of the flood, they brood like huge black spectres over the darkening scene. Blacker and huger each moment they become, their monstrous shadows thrown forward upon the lake, till at length even the after-glow has faded, and, still as death themselves, they fitly preside over the deadly stillness of the Southern night.

A closer inspection enhances rather than detracts from the majesty of the images. They are planted fifty-four feet apart, and face towards the south-south-east. Each represents a colossal male figure seated upon a throne, which is itself supported by a pedestal. Though the faces of both have been hacked out of all human resemblance, yet the shape-

* Nahum iii. 8.

less blocks of stone seem endowed with an indefinable sentience, as if, though bereft even of the similitude of human features, their sight could pierce the endless vistas of space and time. The arms are attached to the sides and recline upon the stalwart thighs; the hands, with fingers outstretched and turned slightly inwards, are placidly disposed upon the knees; the legs, like two mighty columns, rest against the throne and lift up the lap of the colossus to the sky. The whole attitude is that of a giant who has sat himself down to take his repose after the fatigues and turmoil of successful war. The height of the figures is fifty-one feet without, and sixty-four feet with, the pedestal; but of the latter six feet are now buried beneath the accumulations left by the Nile. Before these had been formed, and when the pedestals were bare to their foundations, when, further, each head was framed in the full spreading wig of the Egyptian Pharaohs, and when the faces and bodies were intact, the impression produced must have been such as could be felt rather than described.

Everyone knows that these statues are effigies of the same king—Amunoph, or Amenhotep, or Amenophis III., one of the most famous sovereigns and conquerors of the Eighteenth Dynasty, who reigned at Thebes about 1,500 B.C. The cartouches on the backs of both figures contain his name. Known, too, is the name of the architect—the same as that of the royal master who delighted to do him honour—Amenhotep, son of Hapu, whose own statue, richly adorned with inscriptions, is in the Boulak collection at Cairo. Thereon we read—

‘For my lord the King was created the monument of sandstone. Thus did I according to that which seemed best in my own eyes, causing to be made two images of a noble hard stone in his likeness in this his great building, which is like unto heaven. . . . After this manner made I perfect the King’s images, wonderful for their breadth, lofty in their height, the stature whereof made the gate-tower to look small. Forty cubits was their measure.* In the glorious sandstone

* Taking the cubit to be the ordinary cubit of $18\frac{1}{4}$ inches, this corresponds fairly well with the actual height given above. Others, reckoning by the royal cubit of $20\frac{3}{8}$ inches, have made the original height 69 feet, and accounted for the difference by supposing that the heads were once surmounted with the pschent or duplicate crown of Upper and Lower Egypt, so frequent a feature in colossal representations of the Pharaohs. It is probable, however, that these figures were without the pschent, both because no trace of it is observable upon the head of the southern or unrepaired colossus, and because there were

mountain wrought I them, on this side and on that, on the east side and on the west. Furthermore, I caused to be built eight ships, whereon they were carried up and set in his lofty building. It will last as long as the heaven endureth.'

From this interesting record we gather that the material of the colossi was derived from quarries lower down the Nile, probably from those in the hills of Toora above Cairo, that they were towed or floated up the river on great barges, and were then erected before the outermost pylons of the magnificent temple which Amunoph III., in addition to his works at Luxor and Karnak, was building as a memorial of himself in the western quarter of Thebes. The famous sculpture of the Colossus on a Sledge in the grotto of Ed-Dayr (so happily adapted by Mr. Poynter, R.A., to the subject of one of his best known pictures) will give us some idea of the arduous passage of these mighty blocks, estimated as weighing 1,200 tons apiece, from the river bank to their final resting place before the royal temple.

The most superficial observation discloses several points of difference between the pair. The southernmost colossus is a monolith, and has evidently suffered less from the hand of the destroyer than its companion, though its face and breast are mutilated beyond all recognition. The more northern statue resembles the other from the ground up to its waist, being composed of the same dark breccia or composite stone; but its upper parts consist of five tiers of a lighter sandstone, roughly hewn, and built up one on the top of the other, in rude semblance of arms and chest and head. The thrones and pedestals of both are adorned with deeply incised figures and hieroglyphics; but the feet of the northernmost are covered with a network of inscriptions in Greek and Latin, extending over the instep and reaching halfway up the leg. This latter is the celebrated Vocal Memnon. Its history and interpretation are the problems which we now propose to discuss.

The first question to settle is: When did the mutilation of the one and the shattering of the other (thus necessitating its repair with a different material) take place, and to what agencies are they to be ascribed? Writers have commonly devoted their entire attention to the vicissitudes of the

found in the immediate vicinity, and are now to be seen in the British Museum, two statues in black granite of the same Amunoph—precise facsimiles on a smaller scale of the colossi—both of which are wiggled but uncrowned.

Memnon, without turning a thought to the damage inflicted on the Amunoph. But the two cases must be considered together, and may be found to throw a reciprocal light upon each other; for though a catastrophe arising from natural causes might have overtaken the one while sparing the other, yet the hand of a human destroyer would not be likely to have purposely exercised a similar discrimination.

Of the authorities on the subject to whom weight must be attached, Strabo, who visited Thebes about 20 B.C., and found the northernmost statue in ruins, the upper half having been hurled to the ground, says that the people of the district attributed the downfall to an earthquake.* Pausanias, on the other hand, travelling in Egypt 150 years later, mentions a local report that the statue, clearly not yet repaired, was one which Cambyzes had shivered†—a belief which is countenanced by several of the inscriptions upon its feet.‡ The researches of M. Letronne, whose industry has poured a flood of light upon the entire subject, have shown that an earthquake did take place in Egypt in 27 B.C., shortly before Strabo's visit, and that it wrought terrible havoc among the edifices of Thebes. It has accordingly been accepted—and the conclusion is one which it is impossible to resist—that the destruction of the Memnon occurred at that time and from those causes. Hence has ensued the rejection of the idea that Cambyzes had any hand in the work of demolition, which has been set down as the indolent fabrication of a later age. But here the experience of the fellow colossus may well be invoked. In its case the mutilation is obvious, but only partial, and is such as could not conceivably have been effected by a convulsion of nature or by the mere lapse of time. May we not therefore reconcile the two explanations, and believe (1) that Cambyzes, the great iconoclast, the assassin of the sacred bull, the defiler of temples and tombs, spent his frantic but feeble rage upon these as upon other images, hacking at their features and fronts, and perhaps, by so doing, weakening the stability of the Memnon; but (2) that the latter owed the ruin of its upper half to the earthquake of 27 B.C.? In this way we account for both phenomena—viz. the intentional mutilation of the Amunoph and the undesigned overthrow of the Memnon.

But how, it may be asked, did it come about that the

* Strabo, 'Geog.' xvii. 816.

† Pausanias, 'Attica,' i. 42-3.

‡ Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum, 4730, 4741, 4745, 4749, 4756.

name Memnon was ever applied to the northern statue? The utmost ingenuity has been expended upon the solution of this problem. Each school has been struck by the remarkable confirmation afforded of its own pet hypothesis. Those who explain all mythology by the simple key of the Solar Myth—an intrepid and romantic band—have fastened with avidity upon the evidence of sun worship at Thebes and other places where the name of Memnon is found, and have seen in the reputed image of the son of Eos an effigy of the sun god himself. Others have supposed that the speaking statue was called Memnon from the prophetic qualities attributed in Oriental mythology to the head of that hero. The foolish suggestion has even been made that the name was given because the sounds heard resembled the syllables *mem-non*. A more defensible theory is that Memnon, whom most classical writers connect with Ethiopia, is a figure that might not unnaturally be found in the Egyptian pantheon; and to this idea the title Memnonium, commonly given to the western quarter of Thebes and to the temples of Abydos, lower down the river, has been supposed to lend support.

In reality, however, Memnon had probably nothing to do with Egypt at all. From a comparison of the various authorities by whom the legend is mentioned, Memnon, if he ever existed, must have been an Asiatic prince, who came from Susa, and led a force of Asiatic Ethiopians to the relief of Troy, where he was slain, according to most accounts, by Achilles. How, then, are we to account for the presence of the name in more than one place in Egypt, and for the popular tradition which associated him with that country?

No evidence exists that any such connexion was suspected till the later period of the Greek settlement in Egypt, when it appears in the Greek papyri of Thebes, and in the pages of Strabo and Diodorus Siculus. There can be little doubt, therefore, that it owed its origin to the omnivorous credulity of the Greek immigrants. Eager to find wherever they went a confirmation of the Homeric legend, they fell easy victims to the fictitious identification of famous names. Sir Gardner Wilkinson has pointed out that Miamun was a title of Rameses II., whose great palace-temple at Thebes, now usually called the Rameseum, is probably the Memnonium of Strabo, and whose other temple at Abydos is called Memnonium by the same writer. The name *Mennu* appears also in the Egyptian vocabulary applied to the memorial temples erected by the kings in the Necropolis of Thebes.

Miamun or Mennu might easily be converted into Memnon, and we should thus account for the name both at Thebes and Abydos. It would be transferred with equal plausibility to the statue of Amunoph, and with even greater force if the latter had already developed its vocal powers. For not only would Amenophis find an obvious Hellenic equivalent in Memnon, but the image speaking at sunrise would irresistibly suggest the lamented hero plaintively addressing his mother, the Dawn.

We may therefore conclude that the title of Memnon had in this case no more abstruse origin than an accidental similarity of names, greedily snatched at by Hellenic pilgrims and enhanced by the supposed corroboration of a popular mythology supplied by the vocal portent. That the delusion was not shared by the natives is expressly stated by Pausanias, who says that the Thebans would not admit that the statue was of Memnon, but ascribed it (as we have seen, with perfect justice) to one of their own countrymen, Phamenoph. Two Greek inscriptions upon the left leg repeat the same conviction.*

And now as to the vocal powers so mysteriously acquired by the northern colossus, and which made it one of the wonders of the ancient world. Already we have seen that this statue, having probably suffered injury at the hands of Cambyzes, was almost certainly overthrown, the lower part alone being left standing, by an earthquake in 27 B.C. There is no mention of any sounds before the latter year.† It is a significant fact that Strabo, the first recorded visitor after the earthquake, is also the first who relates the phenomenon. He says that a noise as of a slight blow was believed to issue at sunrise from the upright portion of the figure. He heard it himself, but, he adds, was unable to say whether it proceeded from the colossus or from the pedestal, or from the people standing round, though he was in the last degree unwilling to believe that such a sound could possibly emanate from the stone.

From this time forward a consistent series of witnesses testify to the continuance of the miracle. Tacitus tells us

* *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum*, 4727, 4731.

† Except in inscriptions of the second century A.D. (*Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum*, 4730, 4741), which embody the legendary beliefs of the day. Writers of a much later date reproduce the same fancy—viz. that prior to the sacrilege of Cambyzes Memnon had uttered articulate sounds.

that Germanicus, who visited Egypt in 19 A.D. on his way to Syria, inspected the ruins of Egypt, and bestowed particular attention upon the speaking image,* though his enthusiastic language may be held to reflect the popular beliefs of his own day rather than of those whose history he was writing. Certain it is, however, that from the reign of Nero onwards the Memnon acquired a wider renown. Then for the first time we find the favoured pilgrim recording his gratitude after the most approved modern fashion, in a Greek or Latin inscription, sometimes metrical, sometimes the reverse, upon the legs of the statue. These compositions are of varying merit according to the taste or ability of their authors. One of the best is a Greek stanza carved upon the front of the pedestal by one Asclepiodotus, imperial procurator, and a man of culture, which may be literally rendered thus :—

‘ O sea-born Thetis, know that when
His mother’s torch is lit
Memnon awakes and cries aloud,
Fired by the warmth of it.
Beneath the brow of Libyan heights,
Where Nilus cuts in twain
The city of the glorious gates,
He wakes to life again.
Yet thine Achilles, who in fight
Ne’er slaked his savage joy,
On the Thessalian plains is mute,
Is mute on those of Troy.’ †

Juvenal, who is believed to have been in Egypt in the reign of Domitian, is the next visitor of importance. His words—

‘ Dimidio magicæ resonant ubi Memnone chordæ ’ ‡—

leave no doubt that the figure when seen by him was still in the same truncated condition. Lucian, who was, and Pliny, who was not, an eyewitness,§ both mention the phenomenon. But the zenith of celebrity appears to have been reached in the time of Hadrian. That indefatigable sightseer, with his wife Sabina and a large suite, several times visited and heard Memnon; and so great an impetus was given to the expedition by the imperial patronage, that we find nearly thirty inscriptions dating from this reign. Pausanias, also a visitor about this time and an auditor of the miracle, confirms the description of Juvenal, and adds the interesting

* Annales, ii. 61.

† Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum, 4747.

‡ Juvenal, ‘ Sat. ’ xv. 5.

§ Pliny, ‘ Nat. Hist. ’ xxxvi. 58.

detail that the noise resembled the snapping of a harp string. Inscriptions of a later date prove that the sound from the shattered base continued to be heard till the reign of Septimius Severus. The year 196 marks the last recorded instance.* From that date till the present time the hero has remained speechless, and

‘Memnon’s lyre has lost the chord
That breathed the mystic tone.’

One fact has been made abundantly clear by this narrative—viz. that the ‘rivers of melody’ which, in Lord Tennyson’s somewhat hyperbolic phrase, ‘Morn from Memnon drew,’ flowed only while the upper half of Memnon did not exist. We may therefore give the *congé* at once to all the pretty stories of Aurora kissing her son upon the lips and the latter uttering an articulate reply which have captivated the not too critical fancy of poets or of prose writers claiming a more than poetical licence. The only two authors of anything like contemporary date who give currency to the fiction are Lucian and Philostratus. The former puts the conceit into the mouth of a professional liar in one of his Dialogues† with the manifest object of discrediting the ridiculous tale. Philostratus, relating the travels of Apollonius of Tyana in the first century A.D., quotes the account of a certain Damis, who accompanied the pagan mystic to Thebes. Damis describes the statue as that of a young and beardless man,‡ whose eyes sparkled, and whose lips spoke as they faced the rising sun, and who appeared to bend forward in an attitude of salutation.§ As the evidence summarised above proves that Memnon was at the time of Apollonius’s visit only a sundered and headless block of stone, the philosopher is not to be congratulated upon these practical testimonials to the veracity of his Boswell.

From the fact that the last attested instance of Memnon having spoken was in the reign of Septimius Severus, it may be inferred that something must then have happened to suspend the continuance of the sound. We know from his biographer || that the Emperor himself visited the statue—

* Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 51.

† Lucian, ‘Philopseudes,’ c. 33 ; cf. ‘Toxaris seu Amicitia,’ c. 27.

‡ Both colossi were almost certainly bearded; *vide* the statues of Amunoph III. in the British Museum.

§ Philostratus, ‘De Vita Apollonei Tyanei,’ lib. vi. c. 3, 4 ; cf. ‘Heroica,’ c. 4, and ‘Imagines,’ lib. i. c. 7.

|| Spartianus, c. 17.

the last of the Cæsars who did so—though, as no inscription is found containing his name, it is almost certain that he was unsuccessful. These circumstances supplied M. Letronne with the very clue which was lacking to explain the restoration described in an earlier paragraph of this article. His reasoning may be held to have established that the five tiers of sandstone were added by Severus in the desire to propitiate the mute divinity and to reawaken his full powers of utterance. The futility of these pious intentions, and the coincidence of the repair of Memnon with the commencement of his long silence, will have an important bearing upon the discussion that will presently follow.

The later history of Memnon may be dismissed almost in a sentence. From the beginning of the third century A.D. a cloud of impenetrable darkness settles down upon his fame and fortunes, and no suspicion was entertained that the vocal image still existed at Thebes till it was again identified between 1737 and 1739 by Pococke, who copied some of the inscriptions and published in his travels a description and drawing of the statue. Norden, the Danish traveller, had visited the spot on December 12, 1737; but from the report which he sent to the Royal Society in London, in 1741, it does not appear even to have crossed his mind that the northern colossus was that of Memnon, though he copied a few of the inscriptions and made a drawing of the lower half of the figure. From that time to this the investigation has proceeded with ever increasing interest, notwithstanding the natives, till prompted by foreign tourists, persisted in describing the images as those of a male and female, whom they called Shaama and Taama, an alliterative jingle to which it is doubtful if we ought to attach any serious meaning.

There remain two points of considerable interest before we pass to the explanation of the so-called miracle. These are, the nature of the sound and the conditions under which it was heard. We have seen that it was described by Strabo as the kind of noise resulting from a slight blow, and by Pausanias as resembling the snapping of a harp string. The former idea is reproduced in one of the inscriptions,* where it is spoken of as a high-pitched note, and is compared to the sound produced by striking brass; the latter is confirmed by the language of Juvenal (*magicæ chordæ*) and by the word *crepare* employed by Pliny. We may conclude that it

* Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum, 4725.

was a clear, somewhat metallic, sound, varying in pitch and intensity—sometimes a shrill, sharp, twanging note, at others a fainter and more ringing vibration.

Of the eighty-seven legible, or partially legible, Greek and Latin inscriptions upon the legs which have been collected by the indefatigable assiduity of a succession of scholars, thirty-three contain a reference to the hour or time of day at which the phenomenon was heard. On eighteen occasions it is mentioned as having happened at the first hour, or sunrise, on eight between the first and second hours, on six at the second hour, on two between the second and third hours, on three at the third hour. Two alone date the miracle before sunrise. Nine of the writers, including the Empress Sabina, testify to having heard it twice (sometimes, but rarely, on the same morning); four of them, including Hadrian, three times; two of them four times; and one, a soldier of the Third Legion, no less than twelve times. Two, of whom Sabina is one, relate that they failed on their first visit, but were more fortunate on the second. Another was not successful till the third time of asking. Septimius Severus, as we have seen, never heard it at all. Of those inscriptions, for the most part in Latin, which specify the month, twelve refer to February and eleven to March. These were by far the most propitious months, perhaps because they may have been then, as now, the favourite season for ascending the Nile. These figures, which are not without a distinct bearing upon the issue, tend to show that the voice of Memnon was most commonly heard at sunrise, as soon indeed as the rays fell upon the statue (cf. Strabo, Tacitus, Pliny, Pausanias, and Lucian), but on some occasions not till a later period of the morning. The sound was far from uniform in its occurrence, as the small number of inscriptions, out of the thousands of persons who must have visited Memnon, would alone suffice to show; but those who repeated the experiment might expect in the long run to be rewarded for their perseverance.

We are now in possession of all the facts available to assist us in the elucidation of the prodigy. Two alone of the many hypotheses that have been put forward are worth considering, or present any features of probability. A multitude of wild conjectures, based on imagination, but claiming a pseudo-scientific or mechanical interest, crumble away as soon as they are touched by the merciless finger of fact. There remain the rival theories that the voice of Memnon was a fraud practised by the Egyptian priesthood, and that

it was a natural phenomenon to be explained by physical causes.

The former theory, though not started, was first argued at length by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, in a paper read before the Royal Society of Literature in London, on December 18, 1833, in his 'Topography of Thebes' (1835), in his 'Modern Egypt and Thebes' (1843), and in the earlier editions of Murray's 'Handbook to Egypt;' and has been repeated by most subsequent writers. So eminent an authority may claim to state his own case, and accordingly the following passage is reproduced from the third of the above works (vol. ii. 158-164), which may be taken to represent the matured opinions of the author:—

'The priests, who no doubt contrived the sound of the statue, were artful enough to allow the supposed deity to fail occasionally in his accustomed habit; and some were consequently disappointed on their first visit, and obliged to return another morning to satisfy their curiosity. . . . In the lap of the statue is a stone, which, on being struck, emits a metallic sound, that might still be made use of to deceive a visitor who was predisposed to believe its powers; and from its position, and the squared place cut in the block behind—as if to admit a person who might thus lie concealed from the most scrupulous observer in the plain below—it seems to have been used after the restoration of the statue; another similar recess exists beneath the present site of this stone, which might have been intended for the same purpose when the statue was in its mutilated state.'

Sir G. Wilkinson then relates that in the year 1824, when he first tested the musical stone, the nature of the sound did not appear to tally with the account given by ancient authors; but that in 1830, having noticed the phrase 'as of smitten brass' in one of the inscriptions, he again ascended, struck the block with a small hammer, and received from a knot of peasants whom he had posted below the gratifying response, '*Ente betidrob e'nahás,*' 'You are striking brass.' This 'convinced him that the sound was the same that 'deceived the Romans, and led Strabo to observe that it 'appeared to him as the effect of a slight blow.' And, he triumphantly concludes, 'that it was a deception there can be little doubt. The fact of the Emperor Hadrian hearing it thrice looks very suspicious, and a natural phenomenon would not have been so complimentary to the Emperor when it sounded only once for ordinary mortals.'

It will be observed that Sir G. Wilkinson, in the above passage, starts with the assumption, which he clearly expects to carry conviction to every mind, that the priests were at

the bottom of the pretended miracle, and then proceeds to fit into it, first, the recorded conditions under which the phenomenon occurred, and, secondly, his own local experiments and observations. As regards the assumption, though somewhat defiantly stated, it is one with which *per se* we are not disposed to quarrel. No one acquainted with history is likely to be overburdened with confidence in the integrity of the Egyptian hierophants or to feel any peculiar temptation to take up the cudgels on their behalf. We may admit that these holy persons would have been quite capable of practising the deception had it been feasible or had it in the remotest degree served their purpose. Talking trees and speaking stones are not unknown features in sacerdotal annals. The duplicity of priests is a natural phenomenon more familiar to the public mind than many of the best attested phenomena of Nature herself. It is not, however, on these grounds that Sir G. Wilkinson won credence for his theory and succeeded in foisting it upon the popular acceptance; it was because he supplied, or appeared to supply, evidence of a confirmatory character from his personal inspection of the statue. This testimony has never been examined, and therefore, in the opinion of the majority, has never been shaken; whilst by those who have taken the opposite side in the argument it has been tacitly ignored. Indeed, we incline to the opinion that of all those who have written about the Memnon Sir G. Wilkinson is the only one who really made the ascent. If, however, his account of its existing condition, and the inferences which he is thereby led to draw, can be shown to be incorrect, any adventitious importance accruing to the theory of imposture from the evidence of the figure will disappear, and the case will have to be judged upon the facts and phenomena recorded at an earlier stage of this discussion.

Having stated that there is a sonorous lump of stone in the lap of the image, Sir G. Wilkinson, we have seen, proceeds to assert that there is a squared place cut in the block behind it, which might—and in his opinion, no doubt, did—conceal a hidden juggler ‘after the restoration of the statue.’ As it is well established that Memnon never spoke after his restoration—i.e. after the superimposed ranges of sandstone, in one of which this hollow space is said to exist, were added to the broken base—it is immaterial to the question whether such a cavity exists or not. At the most it would indicate, if true, that deception may have been attempted—and, if so, unsuccessfully attempted—after the repair, a supposition in

itself damaging to the hypothesis of original fraud, inasmuch as it suggests an endeavour to reproduce by artifice what had previously arisen from other causes. Sir G. Wilkinson is evidently aware of this initial flaw in his contention. Accordingly, he proceeds to remedy it by stating that there is another recess, equally favourable to the designs of an impostor, situated not behind, but beneath, the sonorous stone, and in the base, from which tradition, without a responsible dissentient voice, declares that the sound emanated. He is thus *ad utrumque paratus*. If a suspicious cavity is wanted in the broken Memnon, it is there; if in the repaired Memnon, it is there also. Memnon, in fact, cannot escape with untarnished reputation; he can never have spoken without, like the Trojan horse, harbouring a secret of treachery in his interior.

Unfortunately for Sir G. Wilkinson, his statements in both cases are invalidated by an examination of the colossus, and have only been accepted by those who have never put themselves to the trouble of climbing on to the lap of the giant. A ladder—the resource of Lilliput in a similar emergency—and a footrule are all that is required. An investigation conducted in the present year with the aid of these appliances has removed all doubt from our mind and revealed the following as the actual condition of the Memnon.

The original block is split downwards from the waist or starting point of the Roman masonry by a great lateral fissure, converging towards the bottom, and obviously due to natural causes, among which we can refer it to none other than the famous earthquake of 27 B.C. It extends from side to side of the base, and is visible from below, whence it was noticed by Pococke. This great natural cleft is the earlier artificial recess of Sir G. Wilkinson. Towards the top, where the new tiers begin, the crack widens to a width which varies from 17 to 31 inches, at the front of it being the lap of the old statue, and at the back the bottommost range of the later addition. Here, in the jaws of the rent, a block of sandstone— $17\frac{1}{2}$ inches long from right to left, by $22\frac{1}{2}$ inches broad from front to back, and 10 inches deep, and of corresponding colour and material to the Roman superstructure—is caught and suspended. Its sonorous qualities when struck do not differ from those of any other stone in a similar position, and are apparently due to its detached and pendent situation. In any case, we can hardly accept as a final court of appeal the organs, however sensitive, of the Theban fellaheen. Behind and above this stone is a gap in

the masonry of the restoration, from which it has either fallen or been pulled out, the block immediately above the gap having sunk down into it to a depth of several inches, and in so doing having broken away from the Roman cement still clinging to the under surface of the block next again above. If the block immediately above the gap were hoisted up to its original level, and the fallen stone extricated from its present resting place, it would fit into the space which it once occupied, and the gap would disappear. This fallen stone is the musical stone,* and this gap is the second artificial recess of Sir G. Wilkinson! We are now in a position to estimate the verification of the latter at its proper value. For, summing up, we see that neither before nor after the restoration was any recess artificially hewn in the figure, nor any sonorous stone intentionally deposited in the lap of Memnon. The lower cavity was the result of a natural convulsion; the upper cavity has been produced, we know not when, by the very causes—probably the mischievousness or destructiveness of the Arabs—which also detached the so-called musical stone from its surroundings, and dropped it into the mouth of the crack below. Accordingly, Sir G. Wilkinson's case in these respects entirely collapses.

So much for the direct evidence supplied by the statue, and which, instead of positively countenancing the theory of fraud, negatively contradicts it. The indirect evidence derived from the recorded facts is more conclusive still, and on the very points where Sir G. Wilkinson claims its support is in reality fatal to his contention. He argues that the inconstancy of the phenomenon, its scant respect for ordinary mortals, and its partiality to the Emperor Hadrian are proofs of a deep and calculating deception. But he conveniently forgets that if Memnon spoke three times for the Emperor, he declined to utter at all upon the first visit of the Empress, who, as we hear from an inscription composed by one of her ladies in waiting, was inflamed with anger at the affront;† that he also sounded thrice for three other per-

* The indecision of Sir G. Wilkinson himself is shown by the fact that whereas the sounding stone in his later works is this block, in his letter to the Royal Society (*Transactions*, vol. ii. pp. 451–6) it is identified with the stone in the breast, immediately above the gap. We may conjecture that the superior sonorous qualities of the suspended stone ousted the earlier claimant from its proud position.

† *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum*, 4729.

sons, none of them of imperial rank ;* that two visitors, a simple citizen of Cæsarea Philippi, in Galilee, and an unknown Roman, were four times honoured ; † and that whilst his most lavish favours were conferred upon an untitled soldier of the Third Legion, twelve times successful, ‡ his crowning rebuff was reserved for another Emperor—Septimius Severus. There is nothing, indeed, to show that persons of high rank were more fortunate than their inferiors in the social scale, though it is only natural that the successes of the rich and cultured should have been commemorated rather than those of the mass, who in many cases can have had neither the interest nor the taste to command an inscription. The irregularity of the portent will be seen to have a very different meaning. Had the priests been responsible, we may be sure that Memnon would have spoken with far greater consistency and with a much superior discrimination.

In addition to the points already mentioned there are a number of others, ignored by Sir G. Wilkinson, but collectively forming a body of circumstantial evidence, the significance of which cannot be overlooked. If the priests manufactured the sound, how are we to account for the recorded variations in its quality and pitch? Why should the impact of a hammer or similar instrument upon a lump of stone sound on one occasion like a snapping harp string, on another like ringing brass? Why, again, should the voice on some days have been heard at sunrise, and on others not till two or even three hours later in the morning? Such a delay might be inconvenient to the visitors, and would be extremely disagreeable to the incarcerated musician. Are we to believe that for two hundred and twenty years a succession of athletic priests climbed up without ladder or visible appliance under cover of the night, and climbed down on the ensuing day, in both cases defying and defeating all observation? Memnon could not, like the chess-playing automaton at the Crystal Palace, be occasionally withdrawn from view while the operator effected his ingress or egress. He sat in staring isolation upon the open plain, whence he could be seen for miles, where sceptical spirits must have kept watch through many a night and day, and where we

* Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum, 4721-2; Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 45, 54.

† Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum, 4750; Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 40.

‡ Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, 34.

are justified in declaring that such a design would have been quite incapable of execution. Finally, how comes it that for one thousand five hundred years after the erection of the colossi, and long after the Greeks under the Ptolemaic Dynasty had entered Egypt, not a breath is whispered of the marvel; whilst two hundred and twenty years later, after an interval, as we are required to believe, but as was never even insinuated at the time, of highly successful charlatanry, the jugglers suddenly lose their cunning and the miracle ceases at the very moment when such a witness to paganism would have been of inestimable value as a set-off to the growing popularity of the Christian faith? Did the Egyptian priesthood enter upon an orbit of deceit twenty years B.C., and complete it two hundred years A.D., being, as it were, in apogee in the reign of Hadrian? Above all, can we possibly mistake the import of the fact that the period during which Memnon spoke was precisely coextensive with the period during which he remained shattered and unrepaired—a condition which presented no further, but, on the contrary, considerably less, advantages to the artifice than when he was whole?

This also must be borne in mind, that, supposing all such difficulties removed, the sacerdotal caste had not the slightest interest in practising the fraud. Memnon was not a national or local divinity; he had no temple, and was not worshipped, save by superstitious tourists, at Thebes; there is not a shred of evidence to show that in the native mind any religious or devotional idea whatever was connected either with the statue or with the phenomenon; among the multitude of inscriptions upon the legs there is not a single one in Egyptian characters, demotic or hieroglyphic. On the contrary, we have seen that the Thebans persevered, in spite of the obstinate credulity of the Greek or Roman pilgrims, in offering a correct interpretation of the image; whilst one inscription on the left leg contains the remarkable and conclusive statement that the name Amenoth and the title of an Egyptian king were given to it by the priests themselves.*

We hold, then, that the case against the priests is quashed by the most overwhelming testimony, and that the theory of deception can no longer be sustained. We are driven, therefore, to the other alternative; for, if the sound did not proceed from human, manifestly it must have been due to natural, causes. So little, however, is it necessary to accept

* *Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum*, 4731.

this solution as a *pis aller* that it will be found to be the only one with which all the data hitherto mentioned accord, and which at once explains and reconciles the seemingly conflicting phenomena of the case. When we remember that the mysterious sound was not heard till the figure was broken in twain, nor after the fracture had been repaired; that it was heard either at or soon after sunrise, and at no other time of the day;* and that it presented no particular uniformity of occurrence or principle of manifestation, the conclusion irresistibly suggests itself that it was due to some peculiar relation between the warmth of the rising sun and the great block of cracked and sundered stone. If the action of solar heat can be shown without improbability to have produced the noise described, the various difficulties that have been raised one and all disappear. The phenomenon cannot possibly have been regular in its occurrence or uniform in its moment of action, because on different days of the year the sun will have risen in a different quarter of the heavens, and with varying power—sometimes striking with vehement rays directly upon the statue, at others requiring to pierce through an envelope of mist or vapour before its genial warmth could reach that riven heart of stone. This was why Memnon replied to-day in a musical whisper, as though faintly acknowledging the salute, to-morrow with a sharper intonation, as though smitten with sudden pain; why he proved no respecter of persons, and drew no distinctions between the humble legionary and the crowned Cæsar; why to some of his worshippers he spoke with such gracious iteration, to others was so inexorably or incontinently dumb. The power that was in him was communicated from without, and could not be exercised save at the instance of another. Though his lyre was ready strung, the only fingers that could awake its music were the rays of Phœbus Apollo.

Some such line of reasoning has no doubt influenced those who, headed by Letronne, have adopted this solution of the mystery. There has been a practical consensus of opinion

* There are two inscriptions (*Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum*, 4722, 4725) in which its occurrence is apparently dated before sunrise; but the vagueness of the terms employed—in one case *πρὶν πρώτης ὥρας*, in the other *πρὶν αὐγας ἀελίου*—leaves us in doubt as to the precise hour intended. The 'first hour' might signify either sunrise or the space of an hour following; the second phrase is still more ambiguous. The discrepancy, therefore, is one which cannot be pressed, and which, if proven, might be explained as the result either of exaggeration or of illusion.

among them that the sound was in some way or other due to the expansion in the stone of which the base was composed, brought about by the sudden rise in temperature at dawn. The transition from comparative chilliness to sensible warmth is often very rapid in those climes, the sun on clear mornings diffusing a penetrating glow almost the moment he has topped the horizon, and speedily exhausting the dews or vapours of the night. Under these circumstances, a physical change of a somewhat marked description in the substances affected is not surprising, and much more when, as in this case, the particular substance affected was a siliceous conglomerate peculiarly lacking in homogeneity of composition, and with its natural coherence still further impaired by numerous accidental cracks and fissures. Such an object would be extremely susceptible of thermometric variations, and might be compared to a stringed instrument the chords of which were over-tautly stretched.

Nor is this hypothesis left to stand alone, for it is supported by other well-attested instances in which sounds of musical quality have been known to emanate from stones or rocks at sunrise. One of the most frequently quoted is the phenomenon described by Baron von Humboldt on the banks of the Orinoko, where tones as of an organ were heard to proceed at that hour from some granite rocks permeated with deep and narrow crevices. The sonorous properties of the sandstone rocks of El Nakous in the Arabian peninsula, near Mount Sinai, and of the Maladetta mountain in the Pyrenees, which have also been quoted in the same context, are probably to be referred to other causes, and cannot be accepted as analogous in character. But the members of the French scientific commission sent by Napoleon I. in the wake of his marauding column up the Nile (and who, having anticipated Sir G. Wilkinson in his wholesale scepticism about the Memnon, may be claimed as unbiassed witnesses) have left on record that on two occasions—once in the granite quarries of Syene, and again in one of the temples of Karnak—they heard at sunrise the same strange cracking sound, reminding them of the simile employed by Pausanias—viz. of a snapping chord. Dr. Brugsch also testifies to having heard a similar note in 1851 among the ruins of Karnak. These parallel cases are invaluable, both as proofs that the vocal Memnon was not a unique portent, and as buttresses to the theory of natural causation.

Whilst, however, the miracle has been generally attributed by this school of scientific exegesis to the action of the sun's

rays upon the chilled stone, different and inconsistent explanations of the precise physical origin of the sound have been advanced by various writers. Some have believed it to be due to the passage of quick currents of air set in motion by the sudden change of temperature through the crevices of the shattered monolith. But in that case we are tempted to ask why the same result should not have been produced by other and still more favourable atmospheric conditions, such, for instance, as the prevalence of a high wind. Others have imagined that under the influence of the sudden heat small fragments of the stone, which was without doubt extremely elastic in nature, splintered and broke off with a ringing noise. But, were that so, the phenomenon should have been visible as well as audible, and there can be no reason why it should not be repeated to this hour. Others, again, and these are the majority, laying stress upon the heterogeneous ingredients of the stone, have supposed a slight superficial rupture between its component particles, resulting in a sharp vibration. If, however, the integral quality of the stone were alone concerned, the southern statue, which was hewn from the same quarries, ought to have been no less amenable to caloric influence, and should have divided with Memnon the prerogative of speech. In our opinion the phenomenon can only be satisfactorily explained by bearing in mind and correlating two separate factors of the case—viz. (1) the composition of the stone, already described, and (2) the abnormal condition of the statue during the period of vocality, consequent upon the damage wrought by the earthquake. By this convulsion Memnon was not only severed in twain, but shaken to his foundations, deflected from his original level, and scarred by innumerable seams and rents, one of which, as we have seen, almost bisected his still surviving half. To account for the production of the sound we must believe that in one or other of these cracks there occurred, under the waxing heat of the solar rays, a sudden displacement of some moveable portion of the figure, an instantaneous shifting or rubbing of one face of stone upon another—in short, a disturbance of physical continuity sufficiently violent in its operation to communicate a sonorous shock to the atmospheric medium, through which it reached the ear of the listener outside. The phenomenon would then be analogous to the commonplace incident of the cracking of an iron bar in a grate under the growing heat of a powerful fire, or to the spasmodic ringing of a newly ignited stove. Whether this be the true inter-

pretation or not—and the opportunity of scientific proof can unfortunately never be obtained *—we are convinced that in this direction lies the only possibility of successfully prosecuting the inquiry. Human agency, we claim at least to have shown, was utterly unconcerned in the manifestation; and if Nature, the great *Thaumaturgus*, has in the Vocal Memnon propounded an enigma of which it is beyond the scope of existing knowledge to supply more than a hypothetically correct solution—if she whispered to those two centuries of a bygone world a secret to which no Prometheus has yet revealed the key—we are content to recognise in the mystery an additional tribute to the manifold dispensations of her genius.

And here, well satisfied if in the above remarks we have removed any prevalent misapprehensions or diffused a more accurate knowledge about this interesting statue—one of the most interesting that ever left the sculptor's chisel—we take leave of the Colossal Pair still seated on the Theban plain in sublime unconsciousness of the varying sentiments which they have excited in the breasts of so many successive generations. There they sit, the two giant brethren, scorched by the suns of three thousand summers. By their side Stonehenge is a plaything, the work of pigmies. They are first even among the prodigies of Egypt; more solemn than the Pyramids, more sad than the Sphinx, more amazing than the pillared avenues of Karnak, more tremendous than the rock idols of Abou-Simbel. There they sit, patient and pathetic, their grim obliterated faces staring out into vacancy, their ponderous limbs sunk in a perpetual repose, indifferent alike to man and to nature, steadfast while empires have crumbled and dynasties decayed, serene amid all the tides of war and rapine and conquest that have ebbed and flowed from Alexandria to Assouan. There they sit and doubtless will sit till the end of all things—‘*sedent æternumque sedebunt*’—a wonder and a witness to men.

* Unless, indeed, the upper half were again dismantled and the statue restored to its mutilated condition—an experiment which we should like to recommend could we be certain that the base had not been tampered with, and its vocal capacities irremediably destroyed by the repairs of Septimius Severus.

- ART. XI.—1. *Address of the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone to the Electors of Midlothian.* June 14, 1886.
2. *Address of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain to the Electors of West Birmingham.* June 12, 1886.
3. *Address of the Marquis of Hartington to the Electors of Rossendale.* June 17, 1886.
4. *Speech of the Right Hon. John Bright at Birmingham.* Delivered on July 1.

THESE Addresses are the standards and the battle cries of the scattered and shattered hosts now contending for victory in the political arena. They afford therefore an appropriate heading to the few remarks we can venture to make, whilst the contest is still going on and the result of the battle undecided. The language of Lord Hartington is clear, plain, and searching. He goes at once to the bottom of the question and exhausts in a few expressive lines all the details of it. If the result is to be determined by an appeal to the good sense and deliberate judgement of the nation, we are content to rest our case on that masterly State paper, which raises to a very high point our estimate of the ability and the character of its author. Indeed, it is impossible to overrate the services which Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen have rendered to the Liberal Party by their energetic conduct in the present campaign. They have taught the country with irresistible force of argument that the Irish Bills of the Ministerial Party are a delusion and a danger; and they have also demonstrated that the Liberal Party is not wanting in men capable of carrying on the government in strict conformity with those principles which have never before been abandoned.

The issue presented to the decision of the country is plain enough. It is simply the Union or the Disruption of the United Kingdom. O'Connell's demand for Repeal was less comprehensive than the measure lately proposed by the Queen's Ministers. To assert that the Act of Union can subsist when its fundamental condition is violated by the creation of a second Parliament and Executive in Ireland, or to imagine that union exists at all when the link of legislation is broken, indicates a distortion of language or an aberration of intellect not compatible with honesty, common sense, and reason. The late Bill for the government of Ireland was 'Repeal' in an unmitigated form. The condi-

tions appended to it were simply ridiculous or impossible. But the consequences of the decision on either side are still more intricate and multitudinous, and it is not within the range of ordinary political foresight to calculate the unforeseen results to which they may lead. This much, however, is certain: the Crisis, which we have anticipated for some time past, has arrived. It has arrived in a more acute form than we ventured to prognosticate, in consequence of the sudden upheaval of this Home Rule question with the force of an eruption or an earthquake. But we may remind our readers that we contended twelve months ago that there were elements at work in the Liberal Party which must ere long bring about an open rupture between those who adhered to the old established principles of Liberal statesmanship, and those whose politics consist in a blind allegiance to a leader who has carried their colours into the Irish camp. Great efforts were made during the election which took place last autumn to maintain the semblance of union on the Liberal side. Mr. Gladstone's umbrella was very large. It could shelter everybody who aspired to regain the lost seats of office and who hated the Tories. We are now told by no less an authority than Mr. John Morley, that it is rent and tattered in a hundred places like the mantle of Julius Cæsar.

But in truth the electoral battle of 1885 was fought throughout on sham issues and false pretences. We were told in authorised and unauthorised programmes that the reform of Parliamentary procedure, local boards, free schools, allotments of three acres and a cow, and possibly the disestablishment of the Church, were to be the business of the new Parliament. The Irish question was thrown into the background, and if mentioned at all it was accompanied by protestations of uncompromising hostility to the demands of the Nationalist Party. On the side of the Conservatives the faded banner of 'Fair Trade' was waved with equal insincerity. It required but little political sagacity to discover that these hollow cries had no meaning in them at all, and that they would vanish like morning mist or dew before the sun, when the real question, urged on by the Irish vote, forced itself upon the House of Commons. So much we ventured to predict at the time, but we did not foresee that the blow which would prove most fatal to the union of the Liberal Party, and most threatening to the peace and welfare of the kingdom, would proceed from the head of that party and the First Minister of the Crown.

The result of the election of 1885 was indecisive. Neither party could claim a majority sufficient to maintain a strong government, and the followers of Mr. Parnell, obedient to his absolute command, lay in a menacing position on the flank of the two leading British forces. Thence arose the initial question which has governed the whole subsequent course of events. Could the Irish Party be defied and defeated by a union of British statesmen? Or should their support be purchased by a surrender to demands which up to this moment had been strenuously resisted? Mr. Gladstone adopted the latter alternative. Recent disclosures have shown that he has acted in abject subserviency to the Irish Party, and that the scheme presented to the country in the name of Mr. Gladstone was in reality the measure of Mr. Parnell himself.

The political consequences of this ominous alliance are serious enough, but in our judgement it involved consequences still more serious to the good faith, the public morality, and the personal honour of those who contracted it. This selfsame combination had been erroneously, not to say falsely, imputed by the Liberal leaders to their Tory opponents at the election, and denounced by them as *infamous*. No language was too coarse or too strong to describe the horror, contempt, and aversion with which it suited them to regard a political connexion with the Parnellites. Yet within a few weeks these same men accepted the alliance which their rivals had indignantly repudiated, and presented, to the astonishment of the country and the world, an entire scheme for the future government of Ireland which satisfied the immediate demands of Mr. Parnell, purchased the Irish vote, and threatened the dismemberment of the United Kingdom. To us this transaction appears to be the most scandalous and immoral in our Parliamentary history. It makes us blush to think that such a bargain, at such a cost, could be struck in the face of day, and that a considerable minority in the House of Commons could be led to regard it as a pardonable manoeuvre and a venial offence. Our amazement and our regret are rendered more intense by the fact that some men of the highest character lent themselves to a proceeding which must leave an indelible blot upon their reputation, for it involves not only their acceptance of a policy which most of them have heretofore denounced and abhorred, but even a fellowship with men 'steeped to the lips in treason' who are the real authors of the miseries and the crimes which have desolated Ireland.

and threatened England for several years. To these very men it has been proposed to hand over the government of Ireland, and even, by an act of incredible baseness, to consign the most intelligent and industrious portion of the Irish people, who are one with ourselves in everything that constitutes a nation. It is needless to repeat in this place the atrocious sentiments which have been uttered, at various times and places, by Mr. Parnell and his accomplices in America and in Ireland. The very statesmen who are now acting with him hand in hand have been the objects of the most brutal attacks, and down to a recent period their lives were protected from their present friends by the constant vigilance of the police. Mr. Forster and Mr. Trevelyan escaped by a miracle from the conspirators; and the blood of one innocent and accomplished victim marks the reality of the danger with a stain which no time will efface. Yet to these men Mr. Gladstone and even Lord Spencer have held out the hand of friendship, since they have accepted their support and surrendered to their demands. The ill-fated Bill which was rejected by a majority of thirty in the late Parliament was itself an act of surrender to Irish dictation. It was obviously framed to meet a purpose hostile to Great Britain and hostile to the loyal population of Ireland. The real question seems to us to be whether the Queen and the Parliament of the United Kingdom are to govern Ireland, or whether an Irish faction, supported by the contributions of foreigners, is to govern the Empire. It is idle to disguise under the high-sounding names of justice and generosity an Act which is in reality a bargain with a treasonable conspiracy against the union and the security of the realm.

We are unwilling to dwell on this dark side of the picture. Even if the establishment of a statutory Parliament in Dublin were likely to prove successful, and not, as we believe, the baneful source of future evils, we should shrink from a breach of the pledges given but a few months ago to the people of England; we should shrink still more from an alliance tainted by dishonesty, oppression, treason, and crime. No doubt these considerations have influenced the judgement of the House of Commons and the country at large almost as much as the palpable absurdities of the measure introduced by the Government. The protracted debate on the second reading of the Bill tore it to shreds. Never was an important measure proposed by a powerful minister so feebly supported. We look in vain for a sub-

stantial argument in defence of it. One member of the Cabinet appealed to the fears of the British nation. Another flaunted his foolish enthusiasm for a nationality which has no real existence. The defence of the Bill amounted to this, that the wisdom of the Cabinet and its chief could produce nothing better, and that whatever in it was disapproved might be altered. Mr. Gladstone pressed the House of Commons to read the Bill a second time because that vote would give a pledge *from Parliament* to the Irish people that their demand for legislative independence should be considered and granted as soon as circumstances permit. We are surprised at the looseness and inaccuracy of this language. A single vote of the House of Commons on one stage of a Bill, not yet fully before it, cannot pledge Parliament at all. It may be reversed the next day. The House of Commons, which is a fluctuating body, may be dissolved (as in fact has happened) and cannot bind its successor. No pledge can be given by *Parliament* without the concurrence of Queen, Lords, and Commons. To ascribe to a single vote of the Lower House a power of pledging Parliament for ever, would invest it with a power of issuing edicts or decrees like a French convention. Legislation is a work of graver import. Instances have occurred in which a formal vote or resolution of the House of Commons has remained inoperative for thirty years, as in the case of the Appropriation Clause of 1835, which turned out Sir Robert Peel; sometimes such votes have been consigned to total oblivion. A single vote on an abstract question is an attempt to prejudge the details of a measure, and to fetter the decision of Parliament, which will only legislate by a far more deliberate process. That is the very *raison d'être* of the forms of the House.

Mr. Gladstone passes for a great master of Parliamentary tactics, and we shall not presume to criticise the course he adopted, although it has led to total failure. But if he had followed the precedent of Mr. Pitt, who introduced the Bill for the Union by two successive general resolutions, moved at short intervals, it might not have been impossible to carry a declaration favourable to the establishment of local government in Ireland. But such a declaration would in truth be of no value, because the whole difficulty lies in the nature and extent of the proposed local government.

A humorous caricaturist in a serious mood has parodied the situation of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues in a reproduction of Meissonier's celebrated picture of the melancholy

retreat of 1814. It may seem eccentric to compare Mr. Gladstone, under any circumstances, with Napoleon Bonaparte. He has not won great battles; he has not crushed a revolution; he has not founded, though he might have lost, an empire. Since he has been at the head of affairs Mr. Gladstone has not been a fortunate or a successful minister. His best services were rendered to the State at an earlier stage of his career, in a subordinate position, and under a different flag. The painful events which marked his last administration would suffice to dim the brightest gifts of intellect and eloquence; and although they appear to have faded from the memory of contemporaries they will be recorded by the pitiless hand of history. But Mr. Gladstone has some of the characteristic defects of Napoleon. The same unbounded reliance on his own will, which he mistakes for judgement. The same unquenchable love of power, more prized when it is conferred by the inarticulate cries of a multitude than when it is sanctioned by the deliberate judgement of a senate. The same scorn and even resentment of the opinions of other men, when the ideas they represent are not his own. The same contempt for the educated classes of society, because he cannot subdue them. The same belief in popular enthusiasm as the chief force of government. The same hallucination which leads him to regard the creations of his own ambition as accomplished realities, and to spurn those fixed principles of political science and experience which are the only secure bases of free government. These were the fatal errors which caused the melancholy retreat from Leipsic and from many a lost battlefield in France. They may compel the Prime Minister of England to ride in the same direction. The trusted colleagues of his better years have been compelled, not without great personal suffering, to withdraw from his councils, in which their voice was not heard; and he finds himself in the last great contest of his life with a Morley, a Mundella, and a Stansfeld in his Cabinet, leaning on the support of Mr. Parnell, Mr. Schnadhorst, and Mr. Labouchere.

But however we may deplore the aberrations of a powerful mind, too imperious at home and too apt to capitulate to external resistance, however we may regret the disunion of the Liberal Party and the discussion of a question so injurious to the peace of these kingdoms and the work of sober legislation, there is a compensation for these evils in the honesty, the disinterestedness, and the spirit with which all the best and noblest men in the Liberal ranks have stood by the old and

immutable principles on which the party rests. We said a year ago that 'it is to principles and not to persons that we look for the re-establishment of stability in government. The union which is based on nothing stronger than the exigencies of party or personal adherence, and which compels men to give a reluctant assent to a policy or to measures they secretly disapprove, is a false and artificial union. The strength of a party consists in the strength of its convictions; and convictions are based on principles alone.' The leaders of the Whig Party have not fallen short of this canon of political integrity. Compelled to choose between the principles they have always professed and defended, and the sudden adoption of a measure totally at variance with them, they adhere manfully to the good old cause; they scorn to recede from their public declarations or to conceal their private convictions; and they have resisted the strongest temptations that office and party allegiance suggested. Lord Hartington and Sir Henry James refused from the first to join a Cabinet which contemplated the still undefined scheme of Home Rule. Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Chamberlain soon discovered that their influence in the Cabinet could not deprive the measure of its worst features, and they withdrew from it. Their example was followed by a demonstration of unparalleled significance by a very large body of Liberal statesmen and politicians, ranging from the Duke of Argyll and Lord Selborne to Mr. John Bright and Mr. Peter Rylands. This association speedily comprised all the illustrious names in the Liberal party. Their principles were vigorously defended by the most influential organs of the press from the 'Times' to the 'Scotsman,' and from the 'Saturday Review' to the 'Spectator.' Judges, men of science, men of letters, artists, philosophers, thinkers of every class and degree, churchmen and dissenters, all bore testimony to the essential doctrine of one Parliament and one Executive for the United Kingdom as established by the Act of Union. Their arguments, to which no reply was made in or out of Parliament, reverberated through the land. Even the rivalry of parties was hushed by the magnitude of the emergency. The country was moved by an independent sentiment of patriotism and duty. The House of Commons, though new to its functions, gallantly resisted all the manœuvres which were employed to win a packed majority, and braved the threats of caucuses and ministers, preferring even to face a dissolution rather than give a dishonest vote. The Parnellite band, to gain

whose votes these sacrifices had been made, was too weak to countervail a majority of 115 British members of Parliament, and the Bill was thrown out. We may be permitted to say that this victory and the debates which led to it resuscitated the Whig Party; for it was mainly to the courageous and determined attitude of the Whig leaders that the result was due. The Conservatives, whose opinion on the Repeal of the Union was not doubtful, with good taste and discretion of which we in no wise complain, left the Whigs to sustain the brunt of the battle. In justice, however, to the more advanced wing of the Liberal Party, it must be said that it was the strenuous language of Mr. Chamberlain and the great influence of Mr. John Bright which decided the final result. Their resolution to uphold the integrity of the Empire and the absolute supremacy of the Imperial Parliament was the more creditable to them, inasmuch as they were not bound by the traditions of the Whig Party, and the course they adopted caused a schism in the ranks of their immediate supporters, and turned against themselves the organisation they had laboured to create. They were evidently actuated by motives of sincere patriotism, to which they sacrificed some portion of their local influence; they refused to abstain or stand aloof on so momentous an occasion; and the vote they gave was an act of patriotism and duty. The speech delivered at Birmingham by Mr. Bright on July 1 was the crowning effort of a great career—the triumph of influence due solely to honesty, patriotism, and truth. It is highly satisfactory and creditable to the nation that the good sense and firmness of so large a portion of the Liberal Party have resisted, and, as we believe, defeated the artifices which have been employed to lead them into new and dangerous paths.

It would be superfluous at this time and in this place to repeat the arguments which have been used to expose the fallacies and anomalies of the Irish Bills which, we are now told, have been withdrawn, or rather demolished, and are no longer before the country. If indeed they are to be consigned to oblivion, we may be permitted to ask what is before the country? A proposal, we suppose, to establish hereafter an independent legislative and executive authority in Dublin, upon terms and conditions which are wholly unknown, but which must be such as the Nationalist party will accept. Mr. Gladstone declared in the House of Commons that he would consent to reconstruct a single clause in the Home Rule Bill, but no more; and in a recent speech at Manchester he distinctly intimated that he would never be

a party to an Act which should leave the Irish members in the House of Commons, or which should not include the provisions of the Land Purchase Act. If, therefore, these measures are ever reintroduced by Mr. Gladstone, they will contain these obnoxious provisions. His subordinates, more clearly alive to the force of public opinion, and less enamoured of their master's workmanship, have assured their constituents that the whole measure is now open to reconsideration, though in what form nobody knows. There is, therefore, no ground to examine the details of an extinct measure. But it is worth while to point out that as regards the fundamental principle of the Separatists, every one of the arguments now used against it was addressed with equal force to Mr. O'Connell fifty-three years ago, when he moved for a Committee to consider the Repeal of the Union, and when his motion was defeated in the Reform Parliament of 1833 by a majority of 428 votes to 40. The memorable speech of Sir Robert Peel, who absolutely refused to entertain any proposal tending to the separation of the two countries, has been largely quoted, and is doubtless familiar to most of our readers. But the Whigs, then in power, were at least as earnest as the Conservatives in their resolution to maintain order in Ireland, and to preserve and strengthen the union between that country and Great Britain. For that purpose they brought in a coercion bill of extreme severity (though many of its provisions were never used), and Lord Althorp told his followers that it was their duty to uphold the spirit of the Constitution even by the temporary sacrifice of some of its forms, in order to afford the complete protection of the law to our Irish fellow countrymen.

In the course of this debate, Mr. Macaulay addressed to the House one of his earliest and most effective speeches. In the name and on the behalf of the recently enfranchised electors of Leeds, whom he represented, he gave his full assent to that part of the Address wherein the House declared its resolution to maintain inviolate, by the help of God, the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland, and to entrust the Sovereign with such powers as shall be necessary to secure property, to restore order, and to preserve the integrity of the Empire. Ireland had many grievances in 1833 which were admitted by the Liberal Party, most of which have since been redressed. But they were not caused by the Union, and in fact the United Parliament has removed them. The grievances and wrongs of Ireland are not of English but of Irish growth; they are the result of that

spirit of faction which England has vainly endeavoured to control.

Mr. Macaulay asked, just as we ask now, how can an Irish House of Commons, chiefly elected by Catholics, be trusted to legislate for Protestant Ulster? And he defied Mr. O'Connell to point out a reason for having a Parliament in Dublin which will not be just as good a reason for having another Parliament in Londonderry.

But the chief strength of his speech bore upon the vexed and misused word 'coercion,' which is now again brought into the field as the sole alternative to separation and surrender. That is an entirely false statement of the case. 'Coercion' is simply an invidious term meaning the same thing as the authority of the law. Coercive authority is inseparable from the idea of government. The payment of taxes is coercive just as much as the execution of a writ or the punishment of crime. All men in civilised societies are coerced by the law in a hundred acts of daily life, some of which they must perform and from some of which they must refrain. But, on the other hand, no man is brought into collision with the law, or exposed to its rigorous action, until he seeks to break it. Political grievances are no justification of private crimes. It is to prevent men from being oppressed or outraged in their daily business, to prevent cattle from being houghed or ricks burnt, to preserve old peasants from being dragged out of their beds by gangs of murderers, to give security to the cottage, and to enforce honesty and freedom in the transactions of daily life, that the authority of the law is invoked. If this is coercion, it is the coercion which secures to every man his liberty, his property, and his life.

It is a common *ruse* in political warfare to impute to the opposite party intentions and designs which rest on no foundation, and which in fact they loudly disclaim. The cry that there is no alternative between a surrender to the Nationalists and a policy of arbitrary and exceptional legislation, is an artifice of this kind. There are in fact many other courses and expedients which a wise and temperate ruler may adopt. The very existence of exceptional legislation as applied to Ireland is in our eyes an evil and a mistake. The Irish enjoy to the fullest extent the same civil rights as the other portions of the United Kingdom. They are protected by the same rules of criminal procedure, and they are subject to the same repression for the same offences. Far from seeking to establish in Ireland a separate

legislative authority, which would of course enact separate, peculiar, and exceptional laws, we should prefer to establish a more complete identity of legislation. If measures are required to meet the peculiar condition of the Irish people, they might be inapplicable to other parts of the kingdom, where the same difficulties do not exist, but they would be inoperative and harmless. The principal clauses in the late Crimes Act would be valuable amendments to the system of criminal procedure throughout the kingdom, and should be made general and perpetual. If legislation is required to prohibit and punish agrarian outrages, armed associations, or secret conspiracies, they would not affect the population of any part of Britain where such offences are unknown; if they were to occur, they would be just as obnoxious to punishment on one side of St. George's Channel as on the other. But the sting of what Mr. Gladstone very unwisely called 'law in a foreign garb' would be removed. There is no law in a foreign garb in the Queen's dominions. But the law should be uniform and permanent, emanating from the same authority and administered on the same principles.

The true course of policy, therefore, appears to us to be not in the direction of separation, but of a closer union. It does not seem to have occurred to the Separatists that this experiment has never been fully tried, and that if an independent legislature were established in Ireland the possibility of trying it would be gone for ever. To speak of Home Rule as a mode of strengthening the union of the two countries is a contradiction in terms. The whole course of legislation, financial, commercial, educational, and political, would advance on different lines, not parallel but divergent, and the result would be a total severance of the two fragments of one State. It was for some such reasons as these that Mr. Macaulay exclaimed in 1833, 'Repeal I know to be a mere delusion. I know it to be impracticable; and I know that if it were practicable, it would be pernicious to every part of the Empire and utterly ruinous to Ireland.' Yet to solve this problem in obedience to the demands of Mr. Parnell, a scheme has been submitted to Parliament which is neither union nor separation, but which combines the evils incidental to either condition.

It is superfluous to accumulate authorities in support of an opinion on which, until last December, the whole weight of British statesmanship was on one side; and even those who, like Mr. Gladstone, had for fifteen years brooded over the mystery of Home Rule had not yet revealed their con-

version to the world. But there is one eminent witness whose evidence has not, as we can collect, been adverted to as much as it deserves, and it may with peculiar propriety be quoted in these pages. The late Earl Russell was undoubtedly one of the most constant friends of Ireland and one of the steadiest luminaries and guides of the Liberal Party. He had taken an active part in all the measures calculated to extend the liberties and improve the conditions of that country. He had debated Irish affairs when they were discussed by such men as O'Connell, Sheil, Lord Bessborough, and Lord Monteagle; and he was himself an Irish proprietor, solicitous for the welfare of his people. In the last volume of 'Recollections and Suggestions,' which Lord Russell committed in 1875 to the press, he devoted a chapter to the problem of Irish government, and he recorded his own views in the following terms:—

'The question of the government of Ireland is a very large one. I think I cannot do better than lay down the propositions which I wish to establish with a view to the better government of that country.

'I. That murders in Ireland are not the insulated crimes of persons excited by covetousness or revenge, but the deliberate acts of a powerful confederacy which, in defiance of the Queen and Parliament, orders the infliction of a criminal law more formidable than the law of the State. This proposition can be demonstrated both by authority and by numerous instances.

'II. That the Roman Catholic clergy, in the capacity of parish priests, have great sway over the minds of the people of Ireland; but being entirely dependent upon the voluntary offerings of their flocks, are, from sympathy or from fear, unwilling to appear as the prosecutors of the confederacy that directs and executes murders.

'III. That the remedy for these evils is to be sought in such a reform of the criminal law as would place convictions for murder in the hands of a majority of the jury; and, secondly, in making a provision for the Roman Catholic parish priests of Ireland out of the revenues of the Protestant Church, after the expiry of life interests, with a provisional grant in the interval from the Consolidated Fund.

'IV. That the Secretary of State for the Home Department of Great Britain ought to have in Ireland the same powers of administration which he exercises in England and in Scotland.

'V. That Scotland, before the union of England and Scotland, suffered from evils not very different from those to which Ireland is now exposed; but by the wisdom of Lord Somers and Lord Chatham, the Lowlands of Scotland have been led to prosperity, and the Highlands of Scotland have been pacified. A similar policy applied to Ireland will probably be attended with similar effects.

'VI. Home Rule must be met with as peremptory a refusal as that

which Lord Grey and Lord Althorp gave to repeal of the Union in 1830.'

And after discussing the intermediate propositions he enters upon the last, which is most pertinent to the present crisis.

'I now arrive at my sixth proposition, viz. "'Home Rule' must "be refused in as peremptory a manner as repeal of the Union was "rejected by Lord Grey and Lord Althorp in 1830." I should have been very glad if the leaders of popular opinion in Ireland had so modified and mollified their demand for "Home Rule" as to make it consistent with the Unity of the Empire. There can be no doubt that the existing legislation by Private Bills is exceedingly cumbrous and expensive; that great funds are wasted in purchasing private interests, and in giving fees to lawyers for services which are neither conducive to the public good nor advantageous to property. It would have been a great advantage in lightening the labours of Parliament, and in promoting useful public legislation, if the rural parts of England, Scotland, and Ireland had been divided and distributed into municipalities springing from a popular origin, and invested with local powers. The principle of our Constitution, that no taxes or rates should be levied except by popular consent, is grossly violated by the raising of large sums by virtue of the orders of magistrates, named by the Crown upon the advice of the Lord Chancellor. The Private Bills of Lords and Commons do not violate this principle, but are in many instances very costly.

'It is, however, useless at present to discuss the project of provincial corporations. The favourers of "Home Rule" in Ireland have declared very distinctly that what they propose is to convert the legislative Union of England, Scotland, and Ireland into a federal Government, on the model of the old Republic of Holland, or the modern federal union of the United States of America.

'This would be to open a source of civil war over England and Ireland, not against law, but by virtue of a law, owing its authority to the Imperial Parliament itself.

'No matter how well devised the restrictions which might be framed to prevent the province of Ireland encroaching on the central power, the earliest efforts of a popular demagogue at Dublin would be directed to the enlargement of local privileges, to the absorption of one part after another of the central authority by the local assemblies. The taxes, the poor rates, the funds for education, the private property consecrated by the Act of Settlement, the right of Protestants to their churches and chapels, the privileges of Protestants to enjoy their own places of worship and their own religious ceremonies, would all be matters of dispute, and the "Home Rulers," to whom Great Britain would have given power, would then throw in the teeth of their partners in London the concessions which had been made by themselves.

'I own I can see no hope that Ireland would be well and quietly governed under the dispensation of "Home Rule." . . . It will be as well, therefore, that we should look to the declarations of Lord Grey and Lord Althorp, when Mr. O'Connell demanded the Repeal of the

Union as a compliance with his Petition for Justice to Ireland. Lord Althorp said on that occasion that he could not agree to the Repeal of the Union, as he considered it a dismemberment of the Empire.

'Lord Grey as openly and firmly declared that he might support the Union on the ground, "quod fieri non debuit factum valet;" and that without availing himself of that plea, he gave his unhesitating and uncompromising adherence to the Act of Union.'

These extracts show, what in fact is abundantly manifest, that there is nothing new or unforeseen in the difficulties of the Irish question, and the assumption that the government of Ireland by British statesmen and by the United Parliament has failed is a monstrous absurdity. The Government of the Lord Lieutenant, acting in concert with the Home Secretary, in the hands of such men as Lord Wellesley and Lord Clarendon, has maintained the authority of the law in Ireland, at times far more agitated than the present, when crimes were more numerous and the spirit of rebellion more active. The firm and just administration of the Crimes Act by Lord Spencer demonstrated, beyond the possibility of doubt, that it did in fact (in his own words) 'relieve the people of Ireland from a tyranny marked by crime and outrage, springing from a dangerous organisation that aims at the dismemberment of the Empire.' To the demands of that conspiracy, Lord Spencer emphatically declared that British statesmen would not 'give up one point or one idea.' Two years later he is prepared for an absolute surrender to Home Rule. In the intervals of peace which followed these hot fits of agitation the country made great progress. But that progress was again checked by appeals to the passions and the cupidity of the people. The relapse in the last six years has been frightful, for they have been years of mistaken legislation and of continual surrender on the part of the guardians of public order. Yet Mr. Gladstone introduced into the Queen's Speech of 1880 a paragraph lauding the condition and well-being of the Irish people.

One factor indeed there is in the problem which did not exist in the time of O'Connell or even in 1848. The base of Mr. Parnell's operations lies in America. Thence he draws his supplies of money, and if needed the machinery of crime. The contributions of the whole of Ireland to the National League would not support it for a week. The whole agitation is kept up at the expense of the Irish Americans, and it is the form in which they are pleased

to display their hostility to this country. No concessions or modifications of the existing relations of Great Britain and Ireland would have any material effect on the Hiberno-American population.

It remains to be considered what the probable course of events will be when the results of the present election are clearly ascertained. If a majority of the new House of Commons were favourable to the principles of Home Rule, as proclaimed by Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell (a result we do not anticipate), their case is clear. Parliament, which is summoned to meet on August 5, will be prorogued till the end of October, and Mr. Gladstone will then bring forward his Bills in a more or less modified form. The opinion of the House will be taken on the Bills themselves, the exact provisions of which are unknown.

But if, on the other hand, it should appear that the allied Unionist Party in the House has a decided majority, and that the answer of the country to this sudden appeal is adverse to the designs of the Government or doubtful, Mr. Gladstone has already intimated that it would be his duty to meet the new Parliament at once and determine the question. We trust he will adhere to this constitutional principle. It is impossible to admit that the electorate having been consulted, as by a plebiscite, on a single and distinct issue, and the answer having been given, a Ministry should retain office for several months which had twice forfeited the confidence, first of the late House of Commons and secondly of the nation. We cannot for a moment suppose that any English Minister would descend to such a subterfuge. Indeed it would be in direct contradiction to the governing principle of his own policy. The Ministry aver that it is beyond their power and ability to govern Ireland except by forming an alliance with the Nationalist Party and conceding Home Rule. That is their system and their only expedient. If the assent of the country be withheld from that policy they are powerless to govern Ireland at all.

In either event the course of public affairs subsequent to the election must be regarded as perplexing and obscure; but, far from viewing it with any feelings of despondency, we think the leading statesmen of the day have shown a degree of ability, of temper, and of energy which promises well for the future. This has been no vulgar contest for office or for power. More than ever men seem to have felt the gravity of the responsibility which a great public

career casts upon a statesman. No one is insensible to the perilous task of steering the vessel through these breakers; and it is a duty which can only be performed by disinterested patriotism and an honest sense of duty, not tinged or distorted by the deceptive impulses of personal ambition or mere party advantage.

Note on Charles Armitage Brown, the friend of Keats.

IN our number for July 1885, while lamenting the poverty of our knowledge regarding Mr. Brown, we ventured also to impugn the apathy of his adopted country, which seemed to have allowed him to die without any attempt to perpetuate his memory. Our reproach has not been without fruit. A New Zealand Journal reproduced the paragraph of our article, and begged its readers to 'furnish us with particulars respecting the person referred to.' This request elicited a reply from a correspondent, giving a few scanty notices of Brown derived from a chapter in Wells's 'History of Taranaki,' pp. 298-308, a volume published in New Plymouth, New Zealand, 1878. This book we have ourselves consulted, and glean from it these few biographical notices. Charles Armitage Brown was born in 1786, was therefore about nine years older than Keats. He became a Russia merchant, but failed in business through unpropitious circumstances. When twenty-three years of age, he composed a comic opera which was performed at Drury Lane. One of the songs, with 'the poetry by Charles Brown, Esq., and the music by Mr. Braham,' was sung by that great vocalist. After the death of Keats he resided for some time at Florence, where, as we know, he met in 1833 Monckton Milnes. In 1837, he returned to England, and lived for some time at Laira Green, near Plymouth. Here he edited the 'Plymouth Journal,' and gave lectures on Shakespeare at the Institution, which formed the basis of his work on Shakespeare's autobiographic poems. But the zeal of an emigrant possessed him. He sailed from Plymouth June 22, and arrived at New Plymouth November 19, 1841. But he did not live long in the land of his choice. He died of apoplexy, June 1842, about seven months after his arrival. He was buried on the brow of Marsland Hill in New Plymouth. A large slab was placed on the grave, but when the hill was escarped and fortified during the war, this rude memorial was covered with earth, and 'only a few old settlers can now point out exactly his resting place.' (Wells's 'Taranaki,' pp. 304-307.)

A son, Major Charles Brown, not unknown in New Zealand history, still survives at New Plymouth.

No. CCCXXXVI. will be published in October.

CONTENTS OF No. 336.

	Page
ART. I.—La Troisième Invasion. Par Eugène Véron. Deux tomes. 8vo. Nouvelle édition. Paris: 1886,	808
 II.—1. Manual of Injurious Insects and Methods of Prevention. By Eleanor A. Ormerod, F.M.S. London: 1882.	
2. Guide to Methods of Insect Life. By Eleanor A. Ormerod, F.M.S. London: 1885.	
3. First Annual Report on the Injurious and other Insects of the State of New York. By J. A. Lintner, State Entomologist. Albany: 1882.	
4. Compte-rendu des Travaux du Service du Phylloxera. Ministère de l'Agriculture. Paris: 1885.	
5. Observations sur le Phylloxera et sur les Parasitaires de la Vigne. Par les délégués de l'Académie, Institut de France. Nos. 1, 2, 3, et 4. 1881-84.	
6. Enquête de l'Académie des Sciences. Phylloxera vastatrix. Recueil des Documents. 1879.	
7. Farm Insects: being the Natural History and Economy of the Insects injurious to the Field Crops of Great Britain and Ireland. By John Curtis, F.L.S. Illustrated. London: 1888,	358
 III.—The Architectural History of the University of Cambridge, and of the Colleges of Cambridge and Eton. By the late Robert Willis, M.A., F.R.S., Jacksonian Professor and sometime Fellow of Caius College; with additions by John Willis Clark, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In four volumes. 4to. Cambridge University Press: 1886,	
	382
 IV.—1. Auroræ: their Characters and Spectra. By J. Rand Capron, F.R.A.S. London: 1879.	
2. Das Polarlicht. Von Hermann Fritz. Leipzig: 1881.	
3. Verzeichniss beobachteter Polarlichter. Zusammen- gestellt von Hermann Fritz. Wien: 1873.	
4. Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis. By Sophus Tromholt. Edited by Carl Siewers. London: 1885.	
5. Observations of International Polar Expeditions: Fort Rae. By Captain Henry P. Dawson, R.A. Published by the Royal Society. London: 1886,	416

	Page
V.—1. Miscellaneous Works of Philip Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield. 3 vols. 8vo. London: 1779.	
2. A Tour in Ireland. By Arthur Young. 2 vols. 8vo. Dublin: 1780.	
3. Memoir of Thomas Drummond. By John F. Mac-lennan. London: 1875, ...	447
VI.—1. Ancient Marbles in Great Britain, described by Adolf Michaelis. Translated from the German by C. A. M. Fennell, M.A. Cambridge: 1882.	
2. Geschichte der griechischen Plastik. Von J. Overbeck. Leipzig: 1857.	
3. Geschichte der griechischen Plastik. Von J. Overbeck. Dritte umgearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: 1881.	
4. Essays on the Art of Pheidias. By Charles Waldstein, M.A., &c. Cambridge University Press: 1885, ...	484
VII.—A History of England from the conclusion of the Great War in 1815. Vols. IV. and V. By Spencer Walpole, Esq. London: 1886, ...	513
VIII.—Letters and Despatches of Horatio Viscount Nelson, K.B. Selected and arranged by John Knox Laughton, M.A. London: 1886, ...	542
IX.—The Irish Question. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., ...	575

THE EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OCTOBER, 1886.

No. CCCXXXVI.

ART. I.—*La Troisième Invasion.* Par EUGÈNE VÉRON. Deux tomes. 8vo. Nouvelle édition. Paris : 1886.

IN the history of the world there have been several instances of the sudden and complete overthrow of a great military power, as much to the surprise of those not engaged in the contest, as to the utter bewilderment of the nation vanquished. Never, however, were the surprise of the one and the bewilderment of the other greater than when within seven weeks after the declaration of war in 1870 the contest was virtually decided by the surrender of the Emperor Napoleon and his army at Sedan. It is easy to be wise after the event, and Englishmen succeeded in explaining to themselves this gigantic catastrophe in a vague and general way. Certain clear-sighted men had, indeed, as soon as the war began expressed an opinion that the French would be worsted; but even they had never anticipated so complete and rapid a disaster. Even to the Germans the result came, in its thoroughness and the speed with which it had been attained, in the nature of a pleasant surprise, though that they would be ultimately victorious they never doubted. As regards the French—with the exception of a very few, including the Emperor himself—their confidence had been so great, their enthusiasm so high, that when the crash came they could hardly realise it, and were utterly at a loss to account for it, save on the grounds of treason or gross incapacity of the military commanders. That France fairly dealt with by the Government, that French armies, handled with ordinary skill, could be worsted by the stolid, hated Prussians who had been so thoroughly cowed by

Jena, was inconceivable. It was an outrage, a stupid insult to the nation, to suppose that French soldiers were not infinitely superior to German troops. Even if the former had by some mismanagement or an unfortunate accident been out-manœuvred or out-numbered by the enemy, the *furia francese* would have compensated for these material disadvantages. How then to account for disasters which at last could not be denied? Thus distraught with wounded vanity, a scene of recrimination ensued, and every one sought to make a scapegoat of his neighbour. Under such circumstances an impartial judgment was not to be expected from the French, while, dazzled by the success of the Germans, it was not much more easily obtainable from foreigners. Now, however, circumstances are changed: the heated passions of the moment have subsided in France, while as regards ourselves the glamour of German success has waned in its power. The evidence is complete, and public opinion now in a position to weigh its value calmly with a view to establish historic truth.

Animated by the patriotic desire to point out, in order that they may be remedied or removed, the causes of the most startling military collapse of modern times, the author of 'La Troisième Invasion' has striven to place all the facts connected with the war before his countrymen. In the execution of his task he has displayed an impartiality, a contempt for illusions, and a disregard for French vanity which does him the highest honour. The first edition appeared in 1876, when France was still smarting from the wounds which she had received. The edition which we take as our text appears when actual anguish has been succeeded by an aching memory. In the interval of eleven years which has appeared between the two editions the author has had an opportunity of profiting by additional information obtained from those who bore a prominent part in the drama which they describe. Of the causes of the contest and the events which preceded it we do not propose here to treat, but shall commence with the relative military situation of France and Germany on the day on which war was officially declared.

The chief military law of France is still that of 1832, due to Marshal Gouvion St.-Cyr. This law, though largely superseded and altered by successive enactments, is the basis of the French military system, and invariably referred to whenever military legislation is discussed. Startled by the triumphs of Prussia in 1866, the French Government determined to increase its military strength, and at the end of 1867

Marshal Niel introduced a new military law. Its chief object was to increase the number of soldiers of which the Minister of War could in the event of a European war dispose. The French generals were quite content with the military institutions of the country, and looked on the French soldiers as the best in the world. The only drawback was that their number was insufficient. As to improving the arrangements for mobilisation, concentration, the organisation of cadres, for making the staff and the intendance more efficient, not a thought was bestowed on these important matters. The efforts of Marshal Niel were therefore practically confined, as we have said, to increasing the numerical strength of the army. With this view the period of engagement was raised from seven to nine years, five years being passed with the colours and four in the reserve. By this expedient the effectives of the army were on paper increased—or rather would be when the system came into full operation—from 700,000 to 900,000 men without largely swelling the budget. Further to diminish the cost, the Minister of War was empowered to send a portion of the men with the colours to their homes on unlimited furlough. In addition to the regular army, another force, estimated at 500,000 men, was instituted. This force, called the *garde mobile*, was to consist of those who drew good numbers in the conscription or were exempted for reasons of family from service in the regular army. This auxiliary force, which M. Véron stigmatises as a phantasmagoria and a fiction, was evidently of no real value, from want of habits of discipline and knowledge of drill, the law only authorising the mobiles being instructed fifteen times a year during a few hours each time. But, with a few insignificant exceptions, even this limited amount of instruction was not imparted, and the men were neither clothed, armed, nor even organised in regiments. Evidently, therefore, in estimating the real numerical strength of the army, the half million of mobiles must be omitted from the calculation.

As to the 900,000 men of the active army and its reserves, it must be remembered that the law of February 1868 had not by July 1870 produced its full effect, for the reserve only comprised two annual contingents. Other deductions had also to be made before arriving at the number of combatants really available for service in the field against Germany. These deductions consisted of troops in Algeria, at Civita Vecchia, troops in garrison, depots, sick, non-combatants, &c. Thus the real effective was reduced to 400,000

men, including those on furlough and in the reserve. Marshal Lebœuf naturally wished to make the best of things, but even he did not estimate the total number of formed soldiers on the rolls of the French army at more than 567,000 in 1870. This was the actual state of things as regarded the available numbers of instructed men in July 1870; but the nation did not know it, and we will go so far as to say that even the Minister of War did not know it, so successful had he and his predecessors been in surrounding themselves with illusions. Less than a year before the firing of the first shot—viz. on August 16, 1869—the ‘*Journal Officiel*’ contained the following passage:—

‘A regular army of 750,000 men disposable for war, nearly 600,000 men of the mobile national guard; instruction carried in all branches to an extent hitherto unknown; 1,200,000 muskets manufactured in eighteen months; the fortresses in a proper condition; the arsenals filled; an immense amount of *matériel*, sufficient for all eventualities, whatever they may be; and, in face of such a situation, France confident in her strength. All these great results obtained in two years!’

We have seen how exaggerated the estimate was as to numbers; we shall proceed to show how ill-founded were the other reasons alleged for confidence. According to the statement of Marshal Lebœuf, when the war broke out, France possessed for the infantry 1,035,555 chassepots, and 271,439 converted rifles; for the artillery 3,104 field-pieces; for chassepots 113,000,000 cartridges, for converted rifles 95,000,000 cartridges, for field-pieces 383,000 rounds. The result of the inquiry presided over by the Duc d’Audiffret-Pasquier and M. Reaul showed that Marshal Lebœuf was correct as to the converted rifles, but that of chassepots there were only 1,019,000, and of field-pieces but 2,376. As to the latter, for want of harness and horses only 924 pieces could be furnished to the army of the Rhine. The supply of ammunition was so insufficient that there were outside Paris on September 13 only ‘about 5,500,000 cartridges, model ‘1866, with which to provide the fortresses threatened and ‘the troops which were being hurriedly organised; and that ‘as to provisions of all sorts the troops, from the time they ‘took the field, were in want of everything.’

This assertion, sweeping as it may be considered, is confirmed by a selection of telegrams given in the book before us. Thus, as early as July 19, we find General de Failly complaining that he is destitute of everything, including money. The next day the intendant-general telegraphs that at Metz there was neither sugar, coffee, rice, nor

brandy, nor any salt, while the supply of biscuit and bacon was small. The major-general, on July 28, declares that there is not enough biscuit for an advance. The day previous he had represented that the detachments which joined the army were unprovided with cartridges and tents. A large proportion of the horse-collars destined for the artillery were found to be too small. In the 6th army corps there was only one veterinary surgeon to twenty batteries. The intendant of the 3rd corps on July 24 telegraphs as follows: 'The 3rd corps quits Metz to-morrow. I have neither hospital attendants, workmen of the administration, ambulance-carts, field-ovens, nor transport waggons, and in two divisions not even a functionary.' Other corps were almost as badly off in these respects. The finest army in the world is useless if unprovided with means to transport its baggage and food. In this respect the French in 1870 utterly broke down. The Ministry of War had failed to provide an adequate supply of food and stores generally, and even what it possessed in central depots was not forthcoming at the required times and places. Of military carriages there were sufficient, if auxiliary transport obtained from civil sources had been organised and added, to have satisfied all requirements. Here again, however, was displayed want of forethought. No auxiliary transport was arranged for, and as for military carriages the following passage from M. Véron's book shows how little common sense had been shown in preparing them for mobilisation: '8,000 carriages were collected in a single park in such a manner that, according to Intendant-General Blondeau, it would have required six months to get them out and place them at the disposal of the army.' The fact is, we believe, that there was only one narrow gate to the park above mentioned. Untaught by the lessons which they might have learnt from the arrangements of the Prussians in 1866, the French authorities had bestowed no thought on such essential matters as the mobilisation and concentration even of the men intended to bring up the regiments of the field army to their war strength. M. Véron, in a few powerful sentences, thus describes the general situation:—

'The troops were scattered about at hundreds of leagues from their depots, and the soldiers summoned to the German frontier were obliged to begin by going to seek for their rifles and equipment at Brest, at Toulouse, in Algeria, before proceeding to their appointed posts. The defective organisation of the staff and the intendance was scrupulously maintained. No pains were taken to study the military institutions of the enemy whom one was going to fight. There

was not even an inkling of the modifications produced in the service of cavalry in the field by the use of rapid firing and long range arms. The fortresses were neglected ; not one was at the outset of the war completely armed. Disorder and confusion reigned in all our military administration in consequence of our excessive centralisation. Thanks to the fetishism of " the virtues of our fathers," and of the memories of the *grande armée*, France, blinded by an old habit of considering herself the first military nation of the world, was about—with superannuated traditions, a *personnel* badly prepared, a *matériel* incomplete and out of date—to find herself in face of an enemy who had turned to account all the lessons of experience and every scientific discovery.'

Looking on the other picture, we see Germany for years quietly yet assiduously preparing for the struggle which she felt might take place suddenly, and which she knew was inevitable. Each army corps was a complete organism. Every arrangement to ensure rapid mobilisation had been made. To each man and piece of *matériel* the place was assigned. The staff was most efficient, and constantly employed in drawing up and revising schemes of concentration suited for every eventuality, in studying various probable theatres of war, and in making itself acquainted with the military institutions and systems of all possible enemies. The men were well drilled and in a high state of discipline ; while the officers were capable, well instructed, and practical. Above all, the German army was animated, from the highest to the lowest, by a strong feeling of loyalty, patriotism, and duty. There was no such thing as a paper soldier, for every officer and man on the rolls was forthcoming and ready at once to undertake the duty confided to him, to fill the place assigned to him. In mere numbers, also, Germany was superior to France, for the former could place under arms about 1,200,000 men nearly all instructed, and of these 600,000 men of the active troops and the reserve were in a condition to take the field within three weeks. Truly, it may be said that success was assured for Germany even before her troops marched out of barracks, and that in peace she had organised the triumphs of war.

We propose to deal with only two acts of the drama, for the reason that after the virtual annihilation of the regular army of France the ultimate result became a foregone conclusion. There was much that was heroic in the struggles of D'Aurelles de Paladine and Chanzy on the Loire, carried on by armies raised, equipped, and organised with superhuman energy, against the solid troops of Germany ; and the skill with which Chanzy wielded his inferior weapon affords

material for an interesting chapter of military history. Admiration is likewise due to Faidherbe, while the defence of Belfort is an episode in the war of which the French may well be proud. We do not, however, propose to follow out to its bitter end the unfortunate operations which ended at Sedan, or to analyse, as it were, the dregs of the struggle. Neither do we care to dwell upon the humiliating circumstances of the siege of Paris, the surrender of which place to an enemy absurdly inferior numerically to the garrison was due to the incapacity of Trochu. We prefer to concentrate our attention on, first, the operations of the army of the Rhine; secondly, the siege and capitulation of Metz. These were, we conceive, the pivot and kernel of the war, and for their examination we require all the space that we can spare.

War was declared virtually by M. Emile Ollivier on July 15 by his speech in the Chambers, but the formal announcement was only handed in to Count Bismarck on the 19th of the same month. The original plan of the Emperor Napoleon was to form three armies—one of 150,000 men at Metz; one of 100,000 at Strasbourg; and one of 50,000 at Châlons. The enemy would thus be uncertain as to where the principal attack would be made, whether on the Rhine Provinces or the Grand Duchy of Baden. The actual intention was to move rapidly the army of Metz to Strasbourg as soon as the concentration had been completed, and after effecting a junction with the forces at that place to cross the Rhine at Maxau. By this means it was expected that the states of Southern Germany would be surprised in the very act of forming their corps, and be prevented from assisting Northern Germany. Indeed, it was believed that the Southern States, especially Bavaria and Würtemberg, would need very little pressure to induce them to side actively with France. This movement would likewise facilitate a junction of the Austrian and Italian armies with those of France, and the Emperor was certainly under the impression, whether rightly or not, that such an alliance would follow an invasion of Germany. Finally, a large amount of prestige would be gained by, and considerable relief secured to, France by carrying the war beyond the Rhine. No Frenchman at that moment supposed that war with Germany meant an invasion of France.

The scheme was bold and not wanting in merit, but for success it was essential that the French forces above mentioned should be ready to take the field some days sooner

than the German armies; that the latter should fail to prevent the passage of the Rhine; and, finally, that the emperor should be able, after crossing the river, to maintain himself in Southern Germany till the middle of September, before which time he did not expect to be joined by the armies of Austria and Italy. A secondary part of the scheme was that the fleet should transport 30,000 French troops to the Baltic, which troops, strengthened by an army of 40,000 Danes, were to effect a disembarkation, and thus occupy the attention of a large portion of the North German forces.

A great commander, while confident of success, nevertheless does not lose sight of the possibility of at least partial failures. He seeks to guard against their consequences, and, above all, provides for the modification which changed and unforeseen circumstances may render necessary. The conduct of the French strategists was very different. They had, apparently, but a single grandiose plan; they provided for no untoward accidents, for no change of circumstances. In fact, they were distraught with vanity, and though they reckoned on their 300,000 men being opposed, when they had crossed the Rhine, by 500,000 North Germans, they counted on the chassepot and the mitrailleuse to compensate for this numerical superiority. 'As to the possibility of a check, it had not been foreseen, and no measures had been taken to provide for this eventuality.'

Von Moltke's plan was, as M. Véron points out, less complicated. He was quite as much impressed as the emperor by the importance of assuming the offensive, but he resolved not to bring the German troops into contact with the enemy until they were quite ready for the field. When they were ready, the first army, under General Steinmetz, numbering about 84,000 fighting men, was to march on the Sarre, and the second army under Prince Frederick Charles, numbering about 175,000 men, was to march on the Lauter. They were to advance from Sarrebrück and Sarreguemines towards Metz, Pont-à-Mousson, and Frouard in such a manner that there should never be more than 30 kilomètres—nearly 19 miles—between the two armies, so that by means of a single long march they could unite for battle. A third army, commanded by the Crown Prince of Prussia, was to enter Alsace between Wissembourg and Lauterbourg. It was to attack the French troops on the lower Rhine, mask Strasbourg, penetrate the Vosges, and unite with the other two armies in Lorraine. This third army numbered nearly 170,000 combatants. All three armies were so to regulate their marches as to be

always on the same general line, and thus be able to give mutual support.

‘The general instructions were “to seek out the principal army of the enemy, and to attack it wherever it might be found.” Rightly, the whole of the frontier from Lauterbourg to Bâle was neglected in order to act with preponderating masses on the principal line of operations. Indeed, Moltke well knew that if we could barely contrive to anticipate him on the Rhine with 200,000 men, we should require several weeks to raise our numbers to a substantially higher figure. Thanks to the superiority of the organisation and the system of mobilisation adopted by Prussia, it was easy for her to bring into line at least 600,000 men before the French army should have collected 300,000 men.’

The German scheme, while based upon offensive strategy, was also calculated to protect German territory from a successful invasion. Allowing that all the anticipations of the French headquarter staff had been fulfilled, the army of the Crown Prince changing front to the left would have held the French army in check, while the first and second armies advancing before, in their turn wheeling also to the left, would have fallen on the French line of communications.

The French calculations were, however, unfounded. Southern Germany resolved to throw in her lot with Prussia, and the French field armies were not only slow in mobilisation, but they never attained the estimated numbers.

The order of mobilisation had been sent out from Berlin on the night of July 15–16. On the 26th the operation was completed, and the process of concentration was at once commenced. In the meantime small parties of German cavalry had been reconnoitring French territory, and harassing the French troops, who never could come up with them, rarely even see them. The French army was scattered and inactive, waiting for reserve men, stores, and food. It was not till July 28 that the emperor left Paris for the front; but nothing was decided on, and the French were still in a state of unreadiness, when on August 4 the storm broke. Abel Douay’s division of MacMahon’s corps was, notwithstanding a gallant resistance, crushed by three corps of the Crown Prince’s army at Wissembourg, the combat, as so often happened during the war, having commenced with a surprise. On the 5th the Emperor Napoleon divided his forces into two armies, each of three corps, commanded respectively by MacMahon and Bazaine. ‘But the measure was not complete, for these commands were only instituted in order to facilitate the transmission of orders. In other respects the two

' marshals remained strictly subordinate to the imperial staff.' MacMahon at once gave orders to concentrate round Woerth. Owing, however, to the slowness of General de Failly and the manner in which all the component parts of his army had been scattered, the marshal had on the 6th, when he was beaten at Woerth or Fröschwiller, only 45,000 men instead of 80,000 with which to oppose 75,000 Germans, and he was compelled to retreat to Châlons.

On the same day took place the battle of Spicheren or Forbach, in which the corps of General Frossard was completely defeated after a fight which lasted all day. Frossard, whose force numbered 30,000, had been authorised to fall back from his position opposite Sarrebrück to one more secure a few miles in rear. General Kamecke, thinking that the French were seeking to avoid a battle, tried to detain them. The Germans only numbered 15,000 men at first against Frossard's 30,000, but they were gradually reinforced till the numbers were equal. Then the superiority of the German artillery told, and the French at nightfall ceded the field of battle. This result was due partly to the faulty disposition of Frossard, who never appeared on the ground till late in the day. It was Bazaine, however, who was chiefly responsible for the disaster. Under his command and at his disposal that day there was Decaen's division at St. Avold, besides his own headquarters on the line of railway which ran to Stiring, which was occupied by Frossard's extreme left. St. Avold was, we may mention, $14\frac{1}{2}$ miles, as the crow flies, from the centre of the battlefield. At Puttelange were four regiments under General Castagny, at Marienthal Metman's division, and at Sarreguemines Montaudon's division, at distances, as the crow flies, respectively of $9\frac{1}{2}$, $11\frac{1}{2}$, and $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles. Up to 3 o'clock the French had rather the best of the combat, which began soon after 6 A.M., and did not cease till about 9 P.M. With the 40,000 men whom a timely order from Bazaine could have brought up the position would at least have been maintained. A minute comparison of the distances, the distribution of the troops, and the communications actually made by telegraph, shows that Frossard's defeat was caused by the want of reinforcements which might have reached him. This story would be incredible if it were not proved by unimpeachable testimony. Indeed, the whole of the proceedings of August 6 are of the most incomprehensible nature. We have Bazaine quietly remaining at St. Avold the whole day when within twenty minutes' railway journey of the extreme left of the

battlefield ; we have a brigade of dragoons, within at the most a couple of miles of the fighting line of the French, waiting the entire afternoon without establishing communication with the general to whose assistance it had been sent ; and three divisions—the furthest only $11\frac{1}{4}$ miles from the battlefield—all aware that an action was raging, all anxious to take part in it, and yet not firing a single shot, and, though sufficiently provided with cavalry, ignorant of the precise state of affairs. M. Véron sums up his remarks on this battle, which according to him ought to have been won by the French, but was lost through the misconduct of Bazaine, in the following trenchant terms :—

‘ This turning movement would not have been possible if there had been sent to General Frossard some of the regiments which heard the sound of the cannon at 14 kilomètres from there, with grounded arms. Some of the Prussian corps which took part in the battle had had to accomplish in the course of the day as much as 38 kilomètres. The troops of Bazaine ought, then, to have been able to arrive long before them. Why was it not wished that they should have done so ? In twenty minutes by the railway Bazaine could have proceeded to the field of battle to judge for himself of the situation. Why did he not do so ? Bazaine indulged in a prelude to the part which he was about to play at Metz. He had not here to allege the political reasons with which later on he sought to cover his treason. It was not a question of protesting against the revolution, since the Empire was not overthrown. He cared no more for the Empire than for any other government : he cared only for himself.’

The above is a severe commentary on the conduct of Bazaine on the day of Spicheren. The more charitable of M. Véron’s readers, while admitting that the marshal showed himself on that occasion wanting alike in energy and capacity, will perhaps argue that all commanders are liable to make mistakes, to be diverted by imaginary from real dangers, to misconceive the intentions of the enemy. Such is undoubtedly the case, and did the accusation of Bazaine rest solely on the events of August 6, we should be disposed to acquit him, notwithstanding his suspicious conduct in Mexico. But taken as a part of a whole, and viewed in connexion with subsequent events, it is otherwise, and we cannot but regard the events of August 6 as the prologue of the infamous drama of which the marshal’s trial and condemnation formed the epilogue.

We pass over the various changes of plans, and the retreat of the left wing of the army to the Moselle, and come to August 12. On the afternoon of that day the Emperor resigned even the nominal command of the army, and

nominated Bazaine commander-in-chief of the army of the Rhine. On the same day the Emperor wrote him a letter pointing out the critical position of the army, using words which evidently implied his opinion that the retreat should be hastened, and urging him to come to a resolution if not attacked on the morrow. Bazaine, who on receiving the letter of service between 4 and 5 P.M. had proceeded to Metz to see the Emperor, returned in the evening to his headquarters at Borny. It would have been thought that he would at once have decided either to cross the Moselle with the utmost expedition, or take steps to give battle on the right bank of the river. He apparently did neither. In his own book called '*L'Armée du Rhin*,' Bazaine asserted that with the command of the army he had received the imperative order to retire towards Verdun with the utmost expedition. Before the court-martial he asserted that he had received no such order. Be that as it may, it was evident that no time was to be lost, for the enemy were gathering alike on his front and right flank, and were close at hand. Even if he resolved to attempt to check the Germans by an offensive battle, he had to prepare for the possibility of defeat. Indeed, the only object of a battle would be to gain time for a retreat. It would have been thought, therefore, that he would have turned his first attention to the means of crossing the Moselle, and quitting the valley through which that river runs. It was of equal importance to destroy all bridges which would not be used by the French army, so as to prevent the enemy from anticipating him on the road to Verdun. Let us see what he did and what he left undone. There were only four bridges which could be useful to the Germans—the suspension bridge at Corny, and the stone bridges at Pont-à-Mousson, Dieulouard, and Marbache. These bridges were neither destroyed nor guarded; they were only imperfectly watched. There were also bridges at Novéant and Ars which were equally neglected.

On the 13th the Emperor wrote to the marshal in the following terms: 'There is not a moment to be lost in 'making the movement decided on.' This movement was the retreat of the army towards Metz; and on the 12th, before the assumption of the command-in-chief by Marshal Bazaine, the Emperor had ordered General Coffinière, commanding the engineers of the army, to construct as many bridges as possible over the Moselle. On the 8th a similar order had been given, and fourteen had been constructed, when in the night of the 12th-13th a flood somewhat

damaged them. Let us now return to the 13th. It would appear that the marshal rode into Metz from Borny and had a conference with the Emperor, returning about 2 P.M. to his headquarters. Late in the afternoon the marshal writes to the Emperor saying that as the enemy are drawing close a passage of the river under these circumstances would take place under unfavourable conditions. He therefore proposes to fight either an offensive or defensive battle.

Thus we see the Emperor continually urging a retreat, and Bazaine fencing with him. First of all he asserts that the bridges will not be ready till the 14th, and points out in addition that there are difficulties about the distribution of rations. Then he talks of giving or accepting battle before attempting the passage, and finally at 9 P.M. informs the Emperor that he has decided on attacking. He had, however, in the course of the afternoon given orders relative to the passage of the different corps—viz. for reducing baggage, leaving behind men unable to march, and examining the roads leading from the valley of the Moselle up to the plateau. This indicated an intention of effecting the passage about noon on the 14th. No positive orders were, however, issued for the retreat till some time during the night 13th–14th. The precise hour at which the marshal changed his mind about an offensive movement, and why he did so, is unknown.

Having made up his mind to cross the river without previously giving battle, it was evidently of the greatest importance to start without a moment's delay. There were three permanent bridges over the Moselle, which could be utilised without waiting for the fourteen or fifteen temporary bridges, and the latter were, according to General Coffinière, all completed on the morning of the 14th—some of them, it may be inferred from his statement when cross-examined at Bazaine's trial, very early in the morning. Yet the generals commanding corps were informed by a note, dated 7 or 8 A.M. 14th, that the bridges would not be ready before noon. A skilful, careful commander-in-chief, having resolved that even if he fought on the right bank of the Moselle he would do so only with a view to effecting his retreat without pressure, would have sent as much as possible of the transport across the river beforehand in order to have the roads clear. He would also have used as many roads as were available, and these would have been indicated to officers commanding corps. Bazaine neither sent on the transport by the three permanent bridges on the 13th, nor

did he take proper measures for facilitating the march of the troops.

There are two main roads leading westward from Metz : one which mounts by a very steep ascent to Gravelotte, where it divides, one branch going to Mars-la-Tour, the other to Jarny ; and a second main road passing by Woippy, St. Privat, and Briey. This last road was altogether neglected. The great point, however, was to get the army—120,000 strong—out of the valley of the Moselle on to the plateau between Gravelotte and St. Privat, and for this purpose there were many minor roads. Of these no use at all was made. It must be remembered that Borny—Bazaine's headquarters—was only three miles from the eastern entrance to Metz, and but four miles from the river. The whole army was therefore well in hand, and orders could reach any portion within half an hour ; yet apparently it was late in the morning before any of the corps started from their quarters. At 3 P.M. all the corps, save the 3rd, the guards, and Grenier's division of Ladmirault's (the 4th) corps, were across or waiting to pass the river. Wishing to arrest the retreat, General Goltz attacked the French troops about Colombey with the advanced guard of the 7th Prussian corps, which in the course of the afternoon was successively reinforced. Had Bazaine acted energetically, he could have crushed easily the small force at first opposed to him ; or he could, perceiving the evident object of the enemy, have gradually withdrawn the guards, the 3rd corps, and Grenier's division under the protection of the forts, and passed the whole army rapidly over the river. He did neither one thing nor the other, and not only fought what may be termed a standing battle, but sent for, or allowed to be brought back, the remainder of the 4th corps, which was on the point of crossing the river. It is manifest that what he ought to have done was to deal a heavy and prompt blow at his assailants, and, having paralysed or destroyed them, to have completed his withdrawal in an orderly manner, but with speed. M. Véron quotes on this point the work of General Kameke, who says :—

‘ If Marshal Bazaine wished to retreat, he ought not to have accepted battle on the right bank of the Moselle. The fortress of Metz covered his retreat in the most complete manner, and any German corps which should have advanced in the direction of this place could be considered, for a day at least, as out of the reckoning for the subsequent engagements of the retreat on Verdun.

‘ If, on the contrary, the marshal wished to defend the line of the

Moselle by holding on to Metz, he ought, on this day of the 14th, when the German troops were in the most immediate neighbourhood of the place, to have sallied forth with all his force. His success was assured at the outset. The Germans could scarcely have assembled before the 15th sufficient troops to give him battle. In any case, they would have collected all their forces in the direction of Metz, and the Moselle could only have been passed by unimportant detachments.

‘The two armies would then have found themselves in presence’ on the 15th in the direction Metz-Sarrebrück, and the neighbourhood of Metz would have given the marshal the option of a battle or an easy retreat. Thus on his side on the 14th he ought either not to have fought or to have fought with his entire army. This affair of the 14th could only be disastrous to the French.’

The marshal, as usual, failed to take a decided line. He did not avoid a battle altogether, nor did he fight a retreating action; and he sacrificed the tactical successes which, in spite of his conduct, the gallantry of his troops obtained, by causing some villages to be abandoned late in the evening in order to draw back his troops step by step towards Borny. Thus the Germans had some justification for claiming a victory. M. Véron denies that the French were defeated; but, apart from the fact that the French did, as before mentioned, abandon certain villages, the Germans obtained a great strategical success. It seems to us that a test of a victory is this: Two contending armies have each a certain object in giving or accepting battle. Whichever of the two accomplishes his own object is assuredly the victor. As regards Borny the object of the Germans was to hold fast the French and delay the retreat; this they did: therefore they were the victors.

During the night of the 14th-15th Ladmirault’s corps crossed the Moselle, and was followed by the remainder of the troops who had been engaged at Borny. So great, however, was the encumbrance of the roads followed by the army, that on the evening of the 15th only a portion of it had arrived at Gravelotte. An idea may be formed of the want of method, arrangement, and foresight with regard to the retreat, from the fact that the 2nd corps—Frossard’s—left its bivouac at 10 A.M. on the 14th, and did not reach its destination on the other side of the Moselle till between 9 and 11 P.M., after accomplishing a march of about eight miles.

General Frossard, in his evidence before the court-martial, thus expressed himself:—

‘The passage was made with great slowness because the meadows were covered with water in great abundance, and that it was not

sufficient to reach a bridge; it was necessary to go from one bridge to another. We reached the other bank, and we found in the villages which we traversed, and which constituted one long defile, an immense, an unheard-of encumbrance; so that the troops which I had put in motion at 10 in the morning only reached their camping-grounds between 9 and 11 in the evening. That was a fact independent of the orders which had been given; but if these orders had distributed the columns among the different crossings which could have been employed, there would have been neither encumbrance nor confusion.'

The Emperor quitted the army at 5 A.M. of the 16th, and the marshal, now more free to act, hastened to countermand the instructions which he had given to hasten the retreat. He directed that the troops encamped at Gravelotte, instead of starting at daybreak, should await new instructions. M. Véron says: 'The general-in-chief no longer thought 'of anything but of not allowing his communications with 'Metz to be cut, which was so much the less difficult as the 'enemy had no other preoccupation than to push him back 'into that town.'

The marshal in his examination declared that he deferred the departure of the troops on the 16th from early morning till the afternoon at the request of Marshal Lebeuf, whose corps was not closed up. Bazaine added that he did not anticipate being seriously attacked that day; yet, on the 15th, General Forton with his division of cavalry had encountered a force of two regiments of cavalry, a battery, and a small column of infantry beyond Mars-la-Tour, and a skirmish ensued. General Forton was supported by two other cavalry divisions, yet he fell back in the evening.

The marshal, indeed, had betrayed in conversations with intendant-general Wolf and another officer his inclination to remain within reach of Metz. The result of these delays was that in the forenoon of the 16th an attack was made on the left of the advanced troops by a force of Germans at first only 35,000 strong, but raised before the close of the day to 90,000. The marshal had under his hand about 115,000 men, but he kept back a large proportion of his army to guard his left rear and protect his communications with Metz. Had he been energetic and sincere in his professed intention to force his way, he could easily have crushed his assailants and effected his retreat. As it was, after a bloody day, which cost each army a loss of between 16,000 and 17,000 men, the Germans retained their hold of a position commanding the southern road to Verdun. The attack by the Germans was, notwithstanding the large body of French

cavalry at the head of the column, somewhat of the nature of a surprise, so badly was the service of reconnaissance performed. The marshal could on the morning of the 17th either have attacked with superior forces the Germans on his left—and they were apprehensive that he would do so—or have held them in check while he advanced in echelon from his right by the northern road, which was quite free to him. He did neither. He was bent on not losing hold of Metz, and at 11 p.m. on the 16th he wrote to the Emperor saying that in order to obtain a fresh supply of ammunition and food he was about to fall back on the line Vigneules-Lessy—i.e. place himself on the glacis of the western forts of Metz. In the letter to the Emperor occurs the following passage: ‘It is probable, according to the news which I shall receive of the concentration of the armies of the princes, that I shall see myself obliged to take the road for Verdun by the north.’

It appears from the testimony given before the court-martial that the want of food and ammunition was a mere pretext employed to justify a fixed determination not to march on Verdun. There was actually an abundance of food, for the headquarter convoy alone, contained, on the evening of the 16th, 173,000 rations of bread and biscuit, 1,136,000 rations of flour, and three days’ subsistence in other articles. Besides, Metz, only $7\frac{1}{2}$ miles distant, contained an abundance of food with ample means of transport; depots of provisions had been prepared at various places on the road to Verdun; and at the latter place there were 600,000 rations ready for issue. M. Véron says: ‘The following morning, as if to inflict on himself a striking contradiction, at the moment of quitting Gravelotte, he gave orders to burn an enormous quantity of biscuits and provisions of all sorts, in order to lighten the march of the army.’

His assertion with respect to ammunition was equally false, for the army possessed 80,000 rounds for the artillery and 16,000,000 cartridges, having only expended since leaving Metz twenty-six thousand of the former and a million of the latter. But the marshal hesitated at the last minute to show his intentions too plainly, and determined to take up a position less retired—i.e. one between Rozérieulles and St. Privat. What his ideas were is shown by a remark to some officers of his staff: ‘It is necessary to save the army, and for that purpose to return close to Metz.’ If he had really intended to resume his march on Verdun he would not have left to the

enemy the opportunity, as he did, of placing the German army across those roads. Again, on the 18th he would not have concentrated his attentions and his force as he did on the left, but rather on the right. If his object was to withdraw into Metz, then, and then only, the left—if he intended to continue his march, then the right—would have been the strategic flank.

In the battle of the 18th, we have to remark that the marshal allowed the enemy with impunity to perform the delicate, difficult, and dangerous manœuvre of marching across the front of his line. But everything was done to facilitate their success on that day. Canrobert, with only 26,000 men and seventy-eight pieces of artillery, badly supplied with ammunition and with scarcely any tools, not only fortified but held his position against vastly superior numbers till evening. Continually did Canrobert send to the marshal for ammunition and reinforcements, but only received by his direct orders two batteries and a paltry supply of ammunition. Yet there were available an ample amount of ammunition, and the Imperial Guard, with ninety-six pieces of artillery. As for Bazaine, he practically took no part in the battle. His headquarters were at Plappeville, which was three miles from the left and six miles from the right of his army, and so far in rear of his line of battle that he could practically see nothing but smoke. The battle commenced about 11.30 A.M., but the marshal did not mount his horse before 2 P.M., and then only took with him a few officers instead of the numerous staff available, the members of which could have brought him from time to time information of the progress of the battle. As a matter of fact he sent no one to obtain intelligence. He first proceeded to Fort St. Quentin. There he stopped till nearly 4 P.M., when he rode back to the plateau of Plappeville; he went on a few minutes later to Fort St. Quentin. On his way he met an officer commanding General Bourbaki's escort, M. de Beaumont, and ordered him to tell the general that he was to return to his quarters—literally, 're-enter'—with all the guard, and to acquaint Marshal Canrobert with these instructions. Marshal Bazaine declared that instead of the word 'revenir,' he used the word 'rester,' which gave the order quite a different meaning. Captain de Mornay-Soult declared that Marshal Bazaine said to M. de Beaumont, 'Tell him to place himself in communication with Marshal Canrobert, let him intimate to him that he is to remain—rester—but particularly that he is not to engage lightly—à la légère.' M. de Beaumont, being recalled,

persisted in his own version. Captain de Lucale, an officer of General Bourbaki's staff, stated that General Bourbaki, having ridden to the front to ascertain what was going on, left the bulk of his staff at Plappeville. At about 3.30 P.M., those who were left behind at Plappeville received orders to join their general. On their way they met the marshal, who, having ascertained where they were going, said to them, 'It is useless, the guard is about to re-enter—*rentrer dans*—its camp.' Captain de Sancy, who was with Captain de Lucale, said that when they met the marshal he pronounced these words, 'Everything is going on well. We have been attacked with great violence in our positions, but we have maintained them vigorously, and at the present moment we can consider the day as finished.' This conversation, Captain de Sancy declared, took place about 4 P.M. We may also mention that when Marshal Bazaine delivered to M. de Beaumont the order for General Bourbaki he added these words, 'The day is over; the Prussians wished to feel us, and it is all over.' It is therefore clear, after considering the above evidence, that the marshal believed, or affected to believe, that the Prussians had made little more than a reconnaissance in force, that they had made no impression on the French positions, that the affair was over, and that consequently it was unnecessary to support Canrobert. Yet at that very moment the battle was raging furiously; and the idea of telling Canrobert, who had been hotly engaged for four or five hours, not to engage without good reason, or, as he expressed it, *à la légère*, was a piece of audacious and ill-timed badinage.

To resume the progress of the marshal on that day. After meeting on the plateau of Plappeville the officers above mentioned, between 4 and 5 P.M. he proceeded to the Col de Lessey, which joins the plateau of Plappeville and St. Quentin. After stopping there a short time, he returned and placed himself in front of the Fort of Plappeville, remaining there till 7.30 P.M., when, the battle not yet being over, he calmly entered his headquarters; yet the fighting was not over before about 8 P.M. Immediately after dismounting, the marshal sent off a telegram to the Emperor as follows: 'I am ignorant of the extent to which Verdun is supplied. I consider that it is necessary to leave there only that of which I shall have need if I succeed in reaching the place. I have just returned from the plateau. The attack has been very brisk. At this moment, 7 o'clock, the firing is ceasing. Our troops have steadfastly remained

‘in their positions. One regiment, the 60th, has suffered a ‘good deal in defending the farm of St. Hubert.’ Can a more misleading, disingenuous despatch be imagined? Can anyone doubt, after reading what we have written, that the marshal had no intention of gaining a victory or of resuming his march towards Verdun, or that he had any other idea than that of holding fast to Metz? To quote the statement of the court of inquiry, dated April 12, 1872:—‘Did he ‘foresee the troubles which would arise from our defeats, and ‘did he think that having in his hand the only organised, ‘disciplined, and homogeneous army, he could by gaining ‘time treat for peace with the enemy, render himself the ‘arbiter of the destinies of the country’?

His conduct up to the end of the battle of Gravelotte proves first that he did not wish to inflict a crushing defeat on the enemy; secondly, that he did not desire by effecting a retreat to Verdun to transfer the control of the army to the hands of the Government. This conclusion is borne out by the steps he took after the battle of St. Privat. During the night of August 18–19 he issued orders for drawing in the army close to the forts on the western bank of the Moselle. As we have shown, he had previously contemplated this movement, and when on the evening of August 18 some staff officers of the 4th and 6th corps appeared downcast at the result of the contest, he said, ‘Do not be grieved. ‘This movement was to have taken place to-morrow morning; you make it twelve hours sooner.’

In a report to the Emperor, dated August 19, but not actually despatched till the 20th, he expresses himself as follows:—

‘The army fought the whole of yesterday in the positions St. Privat-la-Montagne and Rozérieulles, and preserved them. The 4th and 6th corps made, towards 9 in the evening, a change of front, right thrown back, in order to ward off a turning movement by the right, which masses of the enemy were endeavouring to make under cover of the darkness. This morning I have caused the 2nd and 3rd corps to descend from their positions, and the army is grouped afresh on the left bank of the Moselle from Longeville to Sansonnet, forming a curved line passing behind Forts St. Quentin and Plappeville. The troops are fatigued by these incessant combats, which do not permit them to look after their material wants, and it is indispensable to allow them two or three days’ repose. . . . I reckon still on taking the direction of the north, and of then turning off by the road of Ste. Menehould to Châlons, if it is not strongly occupied. In the contrary case I shall continue my march on Sedan, and even Mézières, in order to reach Châlons.’

Compare these assertions with the ascertained facts and with his subsequent actions. The French army maintained its position during the 18th in spite of a vigorous attack, and the right wing only changed direction to the right, thrown back to avoid a turning movement. It was practically victorious, yet was obliged to take up a position in rear of the forts. This movement and two or three days' rest were indispensable, because the troops were worn out by constant fighting; yet before the fighting of the 18th, when many regiments were engaged for the first time since the 14th, a retrograde movement had been actually arranged for. Again, the turning movement which affected the right wing was said to have been attempted under cover of the darkness, whereas it was accomplished before sunset. There are, in short, almost as many falsehoods as sentences in this report.

On the 20th Bazaine informed MacMahon that he would 'probably' take the direction of the north, but would let him know when he could march without compromising the army. On the 22nd he informed the Emperor that there was no change in the situation, that he is invested by the enemy, but that he is himself constructing defensive works—showing his intention of remaining at Metz—and adding, in order to excuse his delay in starting, that the enemy number 350,000 men. This last assertion was ridiculously false, for there were only five German corps, weakened by losses in action, and therefore at the outside counting 150,000 efficient men, or only a few more than those whom the marshal could place in line.

On August 23 there arrived at Metz a despatch announcing that MacMahon had quitted Reims and was marching on Montmédy, in order to effect a junction with the army of the Rhine. The marshal denied the receipt of this despatch, but Colonel, now General, Lewal states that he handed the despatch to the marshal, and that the marshal incautiously read it aloud in his presence. Knowing the danger that MacMahon would encounter if alone he came across the armies of the Crown Princes of Prussia and Saxony, Colonel Lewal exclaimed, 'Ah, Monsieur le Maréchal, we must start 'at once.' A conversation then ensued, the marshal insisting that he had still many preparations to make before he could march, and Colonel Lewal urging an immediate departure. Finally the marshal ordered the colonel to say nothing of this despatch. A few days after Colonel Lewal mentioned the above facts to Colonel d'Audlan, a brother

staff officer, and to several others, among others to Marshal Canrobert. Though, however, he kept the arrival of this despatch a secret, and afterwards denied its existence, the marshal nevertheless felt that he was bound to do something to keep up appearances. He consequently decided to make a sortie by the right bank of the river, in the direction of Thionville, 18½ miles distant, on August 26. The troops on that day were assembled at their various rendezvous ready to attack about noon, whereas it was evident that the preparatory movement should have been completed by daybreak. The order to advance was not however given, and at 2 P.M. all the corps commanders were assembled at the Château of Grimont for a consultation, close to Fort St. Julien on the right bank. M. Véron describes what ensued in the following passage:—

‘General Soleille declared that the army had only ammunition for a single battle, which was false and in direct contradiction of the declaration of the same general, who four days before, the 22nd, had announced that the army was completely reprovisioned. Now, from the 22nd to the 26th the sole fact which had occurred had been the discovery at the railway station of 4,000,000 cartridges. General Coffinière pretended for his part that if the army quitted Metz the place would be incapable of defending itself. This assertion was not more exact than the other. Bazaine received them both without observation, although Marshal Lebœuf had declared that he was ready to undertake the defence, and that he answered for preserving the town. As to the march of MacMahon not a word was breathed of it. In consequence, it was decided to remain close to Metz, and the troops received orders to return to camp.’

At the close of the council Bazaine sent off a despatch to the Minister of War saying that he had only ammunition for a single battle, and that such being the case it was impossible to force the enemy's intrenchments. Ignoring the despatch received on the 23rd, and pretending not to know of MacMahon's march, he said, ‘It will act efficaciously if ‘an offensive movement in the interior forces the enemy to ‘retreat.’ That Bazaine could have broken through the investment on that day seems at least probable, especially if he had begun his attack at daybreak. Marshal Lebœuf considered that a favourable opportunity was missed, and the German Captain Goetze asserts in his book that the investing works were on the 26th very little advanced. Acting from a central position suddenly against a circle of troops, there was little chance for the latter unless strengthened by formidable works, and, as we have seen, the works were not

then formidable. Bazaine thus managed for the time to escape from the necessity of doing his duty. Unfortunately for him the respite was short. On August 29 a letter was brought by a messenger, stating that Ducrot with one corps would be on the 27th at Stenay on the left of the army, and Douay on the right on the Meuse. The marshal was requested to hold himself ready to march at the first cannon-shot. Bazaine on this dared not abstain from assuming an appearance of activity, and ordered the troops to be ready to march the next day at noon. Why noon? Why not daybreak, so as to take the enemy by surprise and have a long day for the battle and march? He, however, countermanded this order; but the next day there arrived a despatch from MacMahon himself, dated the 22nd, which ended with, 'I am marching in the direction of Montmédy; I shall be the day after to-morrow on the Aisne, whence I shall operate according to circumstances in order to come to your assistance.' To remain idle after the receipt of such intelligence would be equivalent to proclaiming himself a traitor. A sortie for the following day was therefore ordered. It was not, however, intended to be more than a sham. The truth of this assertion becomes manifest as soon as we consider what was done and left undone. Bazaine did not commence the attack at daybreak, and the baggage was left in the Chambière Island, showing an intention to return. No serious endeavour was made to create diversions by making false attacks from various quarters, though a little skirmishing at the outposts to the east of Metz began early in the morning. Finally, all the preparatory movements were made with the utmost slowness, and without any attempt at concealment. At 8 A.M. five divisions were ready to debouch on Noisseville, Montoy, and Ste. Barbe. M. Véron says: 'At 1 P.M. the 6th corps was in position. The marshal had then under his hand 60,000 combatants, and the 40,000 others were following. The Germans had not at this moment more than 35,000 with which to oppose us, and the reinforcements had a long road to traverse. The commander-in-chief decided that he would not give the signal of attack till four in the afternoon.' Everything had indeed been done to render success impossible to the French before the battle began, and when it commenced the marshal did not employ all his forces. Nevertheless, such was the vigour and gallantry of the troops who were engaged that the first line of the enemy to the north and north-east of Metz was carried by 10 P.M. The next morning the combat

was resumed, and the marshal only employing a part of his forces, the French were gradually driven back, and about 10 A.M. were ordered to return to their original camps.

We learn from a note to the German official account of the war that the marching-out strength of the French force employed was 120,000 men, with 528 guns and 96 mitrail-leuses. Opposed to these on the actual scene of the struggle was a German force which at the close of the 31st did not exceed 44,540 infantry, 5,950 cavalry, and 174 guns. On the following day the German force amounted to 69,000 infantry, 4,800 cavalry, and 290 guns. The numerical superiority of the French throughout the two days' fighting called the battle of Noisseville was thus considerable. The loss on the side of the Germans was nearly 3,000 men, and on that of the French 3,547.

The German official account above quoted says: 'The 'arrangements of the French commander-in-chief and the 'proceedings of his troops on August 31 leave no doubt 'that on this day, at any rate, there was a fixed purpose on 'the part of the adversary to break through the lines of the 'German army.' We do not share this opinion, which the Germans were no doubt unconsciously inclined to favour in order to gain credit for the excellent arrangements and splendid tenacity and courage which they showed on this occasion. As we have shown above, the marshal did everything in his power to make the enterprise fail; and considering the valour of the French, and the fact that even after all the warning given to the enemy the assailants numbered on the 31st more than twice as many combatants as the defenders, the victory of the former was *prima facie* certain. The German official account shows how careful Bazaine was to give notice of his intended enterprise:—

'Considerable uproar and the incessant clanging of military bands in the positions of the invested army had attracted the attention of the Prussian watch-posts as early as the evening of August 30. During the early hours of August 31 these conspicuous proceedings were repeated, and in the grey of the morning considerable movement was apparent in the enemy's camps, which were still partly enshrouded in mist. As the light of day waxed, it was seen that several bivouacs west of the Moselle had been abandoned, that large bodies of troops were assembled at Fort St. Julien, and that others were following thither from the left bank.'

Again, Bazaine's own order issued to some of the corps commanders early on the morning of September 1 betrays his designs. In this order he says that according to the

Prussian dispositions either the advance will be continued, or that the troops will hold fast to the positions already occupied till evening, and then return to the environs of Metz. We therefore agree with M. Véron in thinking that the marshal had resolved not to succeed.

The intention of Marshal MacMahon was to give a helping hand to Bazaine, counting on the latter's making an effort to free himself. On the 23rd, as we know, Bazaine received intimation that MacMahon had commenced his march. Had Bazaine broken through on the 25th, after inflicting, as he could have done, a crushing blow on the German troops on the right bank of the Moselle, he could, marching ten miles a day after the 25th, have reached Beaumont on the 30th, the day on which the 5th French corps was defeated at that place. Bazaine could thus have either secured a French victory, or at all events have prevented a French defeat, and have disarranged the German plans. By the junction of Bazaine with MacMahon the French forces would have reached 240,000 men. They would have still been inferior to their opponents by 30,000 or 40,000 men, and a serious disaster would have no doubt befallen them. They had, however, a chance of retreating fighting to the north. At all events they could not have suffered a worse disaster than that which ultimately ensued, namely, the capitulation of two armies. It certainly was the duty of Bazaine to try and effect a junction with MacMahon at any risk, and had he started on the 23rd, when his army had been completed in ammunition, the task of the Germans would have been rendered difficult.

What is quite clear is that Bazaine should, if he did not intend to quit Metz—and he certainly did not intend to do so—have informed MacMahon of his intention. He would thus have prevented his brother marshal from incurring a risk so great that failure with such an inefficient army as that commanded by MacMahon was almost certain. Instead of clearly stating his views and intentions he positively lured his comrade on to destruction, and must be held distinctly responsible for the catastrophe of Sedan.

We will now return to Metz. Having failed on August 31 and September 1 to cut his way out, he resigned himself to maintaining his position. What was his duty judged by the facts then known to him? In our opinion he had three courses of action open to him. (1) As far as he knew, MacMahon was still endeavouring to come to his assistance from the north. He ought, therefore, to have made without loss of

time another attempt to break through in that direction. (2) He had himself spoken of the possibility of breaking through to the south with the view to an independent campaign. This plan offered some chances of success, and the results, if he had accomplished his aim, would have been important. (3) By maintaining his connexion with Metz, and making continual demonstrations and attacks on various points of the circle of investment, he would have harassed the investing force largely, have strained their resources, and probably have obliged them to call for reinforcements or even to raise the blockade. As Marshal Bazaine stated in his memorandum of justification, 'The army ought to remain under the walls of Metz, because its presence retained before it more than 200,000 of the enemy; because it thus gave France the time to organise resistance, to the armies in existence the time to form themselves; and because in case of the retreat of the enemy it would harass it, if it could not inflict on it a decisive defeat.' As we have shown above, the strength of the investing force was largely exaggerated; it did not exceed 150,000 men at first, while Bazaine's army, plus the garrison, did not fall far short of 140,000 combatants. Had he quitted the place with 100,000 men, leaving behind a garrison of 40,000 men, including sick and wounded, the enemy would have been compelled to have watched or besieged it with 80,000 men at least, under the penalty of seeing an important line of communication with Germany liable to constant interruption. To retain the whole of the army at Metz with the view of merely passive defence simply caused the neutralisation of the investing by the invested force, and there was little numerical difference between them. The ostensible decision to which Marshal Bazaine came was that which we have numbered third, namely, the detaining Prince Frederick Charles in front of Metz. We will now proceed to trace the course of events, and judge by the marshal's acts whether he honestly tried to carry out his plan.

On September 4 a major of the staff corps, Samuel by name, sent with a flag of truce to arrange about the exchange of those men who were wounded on August 31 and September 1, brought back the intelligence of the battle of Beaumont, and mentioned that there were reports of a still greater catastrophe. On the 6th some men escaped from Ars brought intelligence of a serious defeat in the north. On the 7th a convoy of exchanged prisoners confirmed this report, and their German escort added that the Emperor,

with the entire army, had been captured. The news naturally seemed too bad to be true, and was looked on as a trick of the enemy to discourage the army of Metz. On the 9th a fresh batch of exchanged prisoners, however, by their testimony placed the matter beyond a doubt; and on the 10th arrived a Captain Lejoindre, who had read in the 'Journal des Débats' an account of the revolution, the proclamation of the republic, and the formation of a Provisional Government. Marshal Bazaine ordered him to speak to no one on the subject. On the 11th, however, Commandant Samuel, whom business had again taken to the advanced posts, was shown full details of the recent events at Paris in the 'Kreuz Zeitung.' There being no longer any prospect of concealing the truth, the marshal assembled the commanders of army corps and the generals of divisions, communicated to them what he had learnt, and requested them to inform the troops under their command. At the same time he stated that after such a disaster as Sedan combats on a large scale must no longer be thought of, but that in order to keep the troops awake, the commanders of corps were instructed to carry on minor operations.

On September 15 M. Debains, Secretary of Embassy, having had a conversation at the outposts with some Hessian officers, drew up for the marshal a confidential report of what he had heard. The report terminated with a summary painting the state of affairs in the blackest colours. It is hardly credible, but is nevertheless true, that the marshal, who was by no means as a rule communicative with the senior officers of the army, ordered the officers of the staff to copy this report, in order to send a copy to each general commanding an army corps. The communication of such a document to any one gave rise to the risk of its contents being generally known to the army, and causing discouragement. There was no object either in depressing the spirits of the corps commanders. Besides, the information had been afforded by the enemy, and might have been utterly untrue—some of it was so—and should have been regarded with suspicion. It was simply a very common *ruse de guerre*, and whatever the marshal was he certainly was not deficient in cunning. So struck was the staff officer employed to have this report copied, with the inadvisability of circulating it, that he remonstrated with the chief of the staff, who spoke to the marshal on the subject. The marshal, however, would only consent to suppress the summary of events at the end of the paper. By the light of after events it is easy to make

a probable conjecture, which is that he wished to restrain the martial ardour of his troops, and induce them to pardon his want of energy; also, possibly, he desired to impress them with the idea that it was useless to give in their adhesion to the helpless Provisional Government. In his vanity and want of principle, he thought himself capable of playing the part of arbiter, or, at all events, of being recognised by the Germans as well as his own countrymen a substantial factor in the problem. What precise course he should adopt in order to attain his object does not seem to have been decided on by this old intriguer of Mexico. In fact, for some days his mind apparently fluctuated. One step he, however, decided on. Under any circumstances, he wished to open communications with the Germans.

Accordingly, about September 15 or 16—probably on the night between those two days—he wrote to Prince Frederick Charles. In his justificatory memorandum he admits having done so; the confession could do him no harm, since the fact had become known, though, by a singular inadvertence, there is no mention of this letter in his register of correspondence. In his justificatory memorandum he begins by saying that in Metz the belief was that the enemy had only sent bad news in order to lower the *morale* of the army, and that it could not be credited that a revolution could have taken place in the midst of a struggle with the invader. He then says, ‘Not receiving any confirmation of the installation of the new executive power, I wrote to Prince Frederick Charles to ask of him frankly the significance and importance of the events which had occurred.’ Thus we see him already repenting of the suppression in official documents of the imperial insignia and the word emperor, though it was only on the 15th—i.e. a few hours before writing to Prince Frederick Charles—we also find him for the first time openly playing a political part. The idea of applying for information to one whose interest it was to deceive him is almost amusing in its simplicity. But the marshal was anything but simple, and we may therefore, without injustice, suspect him of merely opening a door to negotiations with the enemy. This supposition is the more reasonable as we do not know what were the real contents of his letter. Some light is, however, thrown on the latter point by the answer which he received. This reply was dated September 16, 8 p.m., but was not despatched till the following morning. The prince excuses himself for not answering sooner on the ground that he was

absent on an excursion when the marshal's letter arrived. He gives him an abstract of the state of affairs, and mentions, as it were, incidentally that at Sedan the King of Prussia had declined to enter into political negotiations because there was a regency at Paris. He then states that a republic, which had its origin not in the *corps législatif* but in the Hôtel de Ville, had been proclaimed, and that it had not been recognised by foreign Powers, or even universally in France itself. Finally saying that he sends an extract from a newspaper giving details of the constitution of the new Government, he winds up with these significant words: 'Your excellency will find me ready and authorised to give you all the information which you may desire.' This clever letter betrays one of two things: either it had been led up to by the marshal's letter, or the Germans knew perfectly well the sort of man with whom they had to deal, and were prepared for the step which he took.

On the very day on which the marshal's letter was written, or at all events received—viz. September 16—the Mayor of Ars managed to send into Metz several French newspapers containing the proclamation of the new Government to the nation, the announcement that the election of a National Assembly would take place on October 16, and the circular of Jules Favre, stating that the new Government was resolved to continue the struggle to the last, and that Paris could hold out three months. On this the marshal issued what must be regarded as a very safe general order. In it he announced what had taken place, and called on the army to remember that its duties towards the country remained unchanged. He, however, did not expressly recognise the new Government, and made use of the following significant words: 'Let us continue, then, to serve with devotion and the same energy, defending its territory against the foreigner, and social order against evil passions.' There is no doubt that he was intensely mortified at Trochu having been preferred to him in the recent arrangements, and wished, without breaking openly with the new Government, to flatter the army of Metz with the suggestion that the ultimate fate of the nation was in its hands.

Wishing at the same time to appear loyal to the Government of National Defence—to 'hedge' as it were—he caused to be inserted without commentary a proclamation in which the fall of the empire is represented as due to desertion. On the same day he addressed a despatch to the Minister of War, which, however, never reached its destination.

In this despatch he asks for news—though he well knew what had occurred—and instructions, and announces his failure to break out on August 31 and September 1, representing the events of those days as two separate attempts. It is to be noted that he gives no information regarding his own position or intentions. As a matter of fact the marshal only sent letters to the Government on two subsequent occasions—viz. on September 25 and October 21; yet there are numerous facts to prove that communication between the invested town and the interior of the country was frequent. He did not want to communicate with his own Government, but rather to negotiate with the enemy. M. Véron is convinced that such was the case, and the evidence before the court-martial fully bears out M. Véron's conclusion :—

‘ Starting from the day on which, believing in the abdication of the emperor, he saw open before him that horizon when he could say to himself that the future of France was in his hand, and that he might be called upon to play the first part in the near future, he no longer thought of anything but negotiating—to re-establish the empire in the person of Napoleon IV., a child, with a regency supported by the sword of Bazaine—perhaps to become regent himself, who could tell? Once possessed by this idea, by which he seems to have been pre-occupied from the commencement of the war, it became impossible for him to think of anything else, and M. de Bismarck feeling him fastened to this hook was too skilful to allow him the time and the means to disengage himself. Bazaine finished by believing himself so sure of attaining his object by negotiations that he forgot his army entirely. Shut up in his Château of Bar St. Martin he became a stranger to his soldiers, whom he left in the most complete inaction. While the Prussians drilled as in garrison, practising the *manège*, and skirmishing, the French army had neither reviews nor exercises. During the two months for which the investment lasted, the commander-in-chief did not once visit the wounded and the sick. He was never seen at Metz. He was completely absorbed in the dreams of ambition which the calculated overtures of the enemy had excited in him.’

On September 23 was played the first act of the drama called ‘L’incident Regnier.’ It does not seem that this man acted as the direct agent of either the Empress or Bismarck. He was, we believe, simply one of those vain busybodies who in all political crises push themselves to the front, and undertake business far beyond their capacity. Those to whom they offer their services are only half convinced, but on the bare chance of some good resulting they give a qualified authority—generally exaggerated by the recipient—to act as their representative. M. Regnier seems to have been such a person as we have described. We do not imagine that any one believed

in him, save perhaps the marshal, who wished to do so. The Germans most certainly only used him to deceive Bazaine, who, from his letter to Prince Frederick Charles, had practically announced to that general that he was not unwilling to take part in an intrigue against the Government of National Defence.

This Regnier was a half-educated man who had trifled with legal and medical studies, had subsequently turned to magnetism, and had mixed himself up with the political events of May and June 1848. After serving for a short time in Algeria as an auxiliary doctor he had returned to France and engaged in a commercial undertaking. To quote the report of the court of enquiry:—‘Regnier is a cunning and audacious man. His manners are vulgar; inordinately vain, he considers himself a profound politician. He has published numerous pamphlets.’ Such was the character and social status of the man who, on September 23, late in the afternoon, presented himself, in company with a German flag of truce, at the outposts and asked to be taken to the marshal. He was taken to the marshal, and he announced himself as coming from the Empress, who was then at Hastings. Asked for his credentials, he said that for fear of being deprived of them on the road he had brought none, but as a proof that he was an authorised agent he produced a photograph of Hastings with the autograph of the Prince Imperial written on it. There is a good deal of contradictory evidence as to what took place; but it appears clear that he informed the marshal, or led him to infer, that he had established relations with Bismarck, with whom a few days before he had obtained an interview, and that the only means to put an end to the war was by the intervention of the Empress-regent, provided that she could rely on the adhesion of the army of Metz. He added that the Empress wished Marshal Canrobert or General Bourbaki to be sent to confer with her. On this Bazaine replied that as to sending Canrobert and Bourbaki, he left them free to go or stay as they might choose. Canrobert refused on the score of his health. Bourbaki agreed to go, on condition of obtaining a formal order for his departure and a promise that the guard which he commanded should not be seriously engaged during his absence. These conditions were agreed to by the marshal, and on the 25th, at 5 A.M., Regnier and Bourbaki, with seven members of a Luxemburg society for the relief of sick and wounded, passed through the German lines.

In connexion with this affair there are to be noted the following significant circumstances. When Regnier on the 23rd presented himself at the French outposts, the German officer in charge of the flag of truce, in reply to a question from the French officer who received him, professed to know nothing about the man. When on the morning of the 24th he returned to the investing army no difficulty was made about receiving him, and he announced that he would return to Metz in the course of the day, and he did return. This proved a perfect understanding with the German authorities. Regnier said in his deposition: 'I presented to him a view of Hastings, on the back of which the Prince Imperial had written his signature, and I begged him to be kind enough to join his own to it in order that I might by showing it to M. de Bismarck prove that I had his assent. The marshal granted the signature asked for.' The marshal on being interrogated with reference to this incident replied: 'I had not a photograph: and he begged me to sign by the side of the signature of the Prince Imperial, which I did without *arrière-pensée*.' It is surely singular that the marshal should have given his signature, as a mere matter of civility, to a perfect stranger, a man of no social or official status, a so-called diplomatic agent who had no credentials, but who had undoubtedly discussed a question of the highest importance. He declared that his signature had no meaning attached to it. Regnier said that it was requested and given as a proof that the marshal was disposed to treat with the enemy concerning the future of France. Both Regnier and the marshal, to judge by their antecedents, were by no means witnesses to whom implicit credence should be given, and both had strong motives for their assertions when examined. The fact remains, however, that the marshal did affix his signature to the photograph, and he can only have done so with one object. Whatever else he was, the marshal certainly was not a simple-minded man.

Another singular fact is that the order for Bourbaki's departure was dated September 15 instead of the 25th, the date on which the document was actually written. The marshal declared that this was due to his imperfect writing, that he really intended to write 25, but that owing to an old wound in his wrist he was unable to form his figures correctly. He added that Bourbaki having received the order on the evening of the 24th, he had the whole night in which to discover the error and get the date rectified. As a matter of fact, Bourbaki started on the evening of the 24th with the

intention of at once passing the German lines. The enemy, however, did not reply to the trumpet-sound announcing a flag of truce, and Bourbaki did not quit the French lines till early next morning. It is not strange, therefore, that the general did not notice the error before starting.

To avoid a break in the continuity of the narrative, we will follow the negotiations thus begun to the end. Regnier had given the marshal to understand that in the course of a few days after his departure from Metz the former should hear from him. He did not keep his word, perhaps he was prevented by the Germans from doing so. Bourbaki also found that he had been sent on a fool's errand. To quote from M. Véron :—

‘ Arrived at Hastings, General Bourbaki saw at the first word that he was not expected, that the Empress did not wish to compromise herself by a direct intervention in the conspiracy woven by Regnier, and returned to France. Not being able to re-enter Metz, he at length decided to go and offer his services to the Government of Tours.’

On October 12, Bazaine, having obtained a safe conduct, sent General Boyer, his first aide-de-camp, to Versailles, provided with a letter for Bismarck, and, as M. Véron reasonably conjectures, furnished ‘ with verbal instructions no doubt ‘ more precise.’ His mission had for its object to try to obtain a military convention. On the 14th he arrived at his destination, and after two interviews with Bismarck started on his return to Metz on the 15th, with, to quote his own evidence before the court-martial, the following decision of the king: ‘ That it was no longer a question at this ‘ moment either of a military convention, a capitulation, ‘ or the surrender of Metz, but solely of a treaty between ‘ the Empress and the German authorities in order to fix ‘ the basis of peace.’ General Boyer reached Metz on the 17th, and the marshal at once caused to be announced to the army—with an obviously sinister intention—the information which Bismarck had given to General Boyer, to the effect that ‘ Rennes, Nantes, and many other towns had, ‘ like Rouen and Havre, asked for German garrisons; that the ‘ members of the Government, completely at variance, had ‘ separated and returned each in different directions; that ‘ Italy reclaimed Nice, Savoy, and Corsica; that religious ‘ questions were on the point of causing revolts in La Vendée ‘ and Brittany.’ It is needless to add that this statement was false; but even had it been true the marshal clearly ought to have kept such depressing information to himself. It may

here be mentioned that though General Boyer was despatched on this mission by the authority of a council of war, the marshal's personal responsibility is not thereby diminished.

On October 18 there was another council of war, in order to hear the result of General Boyer's mission. He related to the assembled officers what had occurred at Versailles, repeating that Bismarck had told him of the dangerous state of France. The marshal—though he possessed newspapers which by no means confirmed this statement—did not attempt to cast any doubt on the accuracy of the assertions in question. It was not his object to do so—quite the reverse, indeed. The result of the council was that the departure of General Boyer for England, in order to induce the Empress to arrange a treaty with the Germans, was sanctioned. On October 19, accordingly, he started, and in due course reached England, and saw the empress. She at once placed herself in communication with both the King of Prussia and Bismarck with a view to arranging a treaty of peace; but it soon became evident that the Germans were only fooling Bazaine, and were thoroughly dishonest in their dealings with the Empress. Indeed, the duplicity and hypocrisy of Bismarck and his master all through the war and the events which led to it become plainer and plainer the more the facts, as distinguished from mere assertions, are studied.

We will now return to the military events at Metz from the date of the actions of August 31 and September 1. Metz and its neighbourhood constituted an intrenched camp, not merely a fortified town with advanced works. An intrenched camp is of considerable value if its proper use be understood, but a snare and a peril in the hands of an unskilful general. It enables a beaten army to reorganise itself; it protects the organisation of a force of recruits, or the welding together of materials which are not homogeneous; it permits an army to occupy a position of strategical value without tactical disquietudes; finally, it serves as a temporary place of refuge for beaten or outnumbered forces till relieved by a friendly army. Regarded from a purely tactical point of view, an intrenched camp possesses considerable advantage. The outlying forts and the troops support each other, and the latter assume the offensive with all the more confidence that they know that a means of retreat and a place of refuge are always at hand. Owing to the existence of the forts every portion of the outer line is safe against a *coup de main*. The moveable army can therefore, temporarily abandoning the forts to their own resources for resistance,

bring the whole of its men to bear upon a single point—can, in short, assume the offensive without hesitation or reserve. Should the intrenched camp be invested, it is evident that the investing circle must have a radius which exceeds that of the defensive circle by at least the effective range of artillery, say a mile and a half. Consequently, supposing the troops on both sides to be equally distributed round the two concentric circles at the rate of so many men per yard of perimeter, the investing army will require in theory to be very much more numerous than the invested army. In practice, however, troops do not engage over a long extent in parallel lines: the nature of the ground alone would generally render such a proceeding impossible; but it is the object of a commander, either by deceiving the enemy, by skilful manœuvring, or by sudden, secret, and unexpected movements, to bring a large body of his own troops to bear on a smaller body of the enemy's troops. The commander of a force surrounded in an intrenched camp enjoys great facilities for applying this fundamental principle of tactics, for he can operate from the centre to the circumference, while to meet his attack the commander of the investing force is compelled to bring up reinforcements by an arc which must be much longer than the straight line used by his opponent. The investing force, unless possessed of an enormous numerical superiority, relies upon the following means to baffle an attempt to break through his lines: constant and acute vigilance, information from spies, a judicious distribution of supports and reserves, a well-organised system of rapidly transmitting intelligence and orders, good means of communication, field works and obstacles for delaying the progress of the enemy, and, above all, the discipline, mobility, activity, and valour of the troops. To any but troops of the highest quality well commanded, the attempt to invest an intrenched camp is a most perilous undertaking. On the other hand, the invested force, unless it be also composed of excellent troops with an able general at the head of them, cannot turn to account the advantages of their position. This is more especially the case when the invested army is large, for unless an army be well organised, well disciplined, and well handled, mere numerical strength is, in a certain sense, an absolute disadvantage.

In the case of Metz the French army numbered at the capitulation 173,000 of all ranks, including national guards, francs-tireurs, men in hospital, and 23,000 constituting the

garrison. Thus even at the last there must have been available for an offensive movement 120,000 combatants, allowing for keeping up a chain of outposts. The German army never exceeded 170,000 men till after the fall of Strasbourg on September 28, when Prince Frederick Charles was reinforced by a portion of the force which had been employed in the siege of that town. Making, however, allowances for a certain number of men required at the outposts, the sick, &c., we may fairly estimate the largest number of combatants which could, without abandoning the blockade, have been concentrated at a given point at 150,000. Till the reinforcements above mentioned had arrived this number was much lower. But Prince Frederick Charles would have had to guard against serious attempts to break out at various points, and would therefore have hesitated to concentrate at first at any one spot more than 120,000 men—i.e. a number equal to those disposable by Bazaine. The circle of investment, moreover, was measured on a circumference, indicated by the different camps and bivouacs, about forty miles long. The most distant of the German troops would therefore have to march twenty miles to reach a point attacked, while the French could all reach it in less than ten miles. Evidently, therefore, if preparations had been made with care and secrecy, and the initiatory movements performed under cover of the darkness, success would have been almost assured to the French, had the attack been executed with vigour by the whole army, leaving it to the garrison to make misleading demonstrations.

We have seen that the engagement of August 31 and September 1 was prepared for and arranged in such a manner that the Germans had a considerable amount of warning. On the evening of August 30 and the following morning Bazaine's intention was obvious, for the attack was not commenced till 4 P.M., and then was not made simultaneously, or with all the means at the marshal's disposal. Had there been any real intention to break out, the attack would have been made about 6 A.M. on August 31, when, if due precautions had been observed, the Germans must have been crushed, and there would have remained twelve hours of daylight for the march. Thionville being only 18½ miles from Metz, and the battle being begun some two or three miles in advance of the town, the advanced guard of the French would have reached their destination early in the afternoon, and all save the rear-guard would have been close up before dark. It is true that they would have been

obliged to fight all the way, but the Germans could not have collected 40,000 men to oppose them till the afternoon. Besides, vigorous demonstrations from Metz in several directions would, to a great extent, have prevented the despatch of reinforcements to the northern portion of the circle of investment. The French would have had to march, say, fifteen miles from the time they came into contact with the German troops, and for 100,000 to 120,000 men, even if three or four roads be available, fifteen miles is a long day's march. But it must be remembered that Thionville being well supplied with provisions and stores, it would have been sufficient to have taken with the army only what is termed by the French the 'train de combat.' Bazaine, however, had no intention of breaking out on August 31, or even on September 1. But there was an alternative course of action, which was—to capture the German lines of investment in the direction of Thionville, and, profiting by numerical superiority at the point where he wished to break through, to inflict so heavy a blow upon the German army as to paralyse any attempt on their part to hold Bazaine fast. With secrecy, and an attack carried out with energy, success would probably have attended the effort.

After September 1 there were constant little partisan affairs carried out by a company, or even a smaller body, chiefly for the purpose of collecting forage; the excuse made by Bazaine for not doing more being the bad state of the weather. The Germans would, however, have been as much impeded by the rain as the French. To quote the report of the court of enquiry:—

'It had been agreed on August 26 that the troops should be kept in breath by a series of operations, and that the enemy should be harassed. In place of carrying out this programme, limited as it was, the marshal remained completely inactive. To such an extent was his inaction carried that the enemy were able to construct, without being in any way disturbed, the branch line from Remilly to Pont-à-Mousson which, avoiding Metz, connected the Sarrebrück to the Nancy line. In face of the protests which the inactivity of the army produced, the marshal at last decided, about September 20, to order a series of foraging expeditions, having for their object the collecting the provisions contained in the villages near his camp. But he left to the initiative of each of the commandants of army corps the conduct of the operations to be executed in front of the camps occupied by their own troops. These operations, for which were required a single direction and the co-operation of all, were destined to fail completely.'

The marshal's own explanation of his inactivity when his central position enabled him to fall with superior forces on

the enemy, divided into three parts by as many streams, we give in his own words :—

‘ The distribution of the troops on the two banks of the Moselle does not constitute a central position from a tactical point of view, the enemy occupying moreover the culminating points of both banks ; it is necessary, besides, to leave men to guard the works of the intrenched camp. It is not then possible to surprise the enemy at one point and to overwhelm him with these superior forces, in the topographical condition of Metz and its intrenched camp. From another point of view, the corps composing the army of Metz had suffered considerable losses in the preceding actions, principally in the cadres. It was necessary, therefore, as I have said above, to nurse this army and leave nothing to chance. As to a sortie with the intention of holding the field I judged it impossible after Sedan ; the army would have been dispersed, and would have disbanded after the second day’s march, considering the strength of the army in the field.’

This excuse gives rise to the following obvious remarks : The passage from one bank of the Moselle to the other would have been rendered easy had the bridges improvised between the 8th and 12th of August, and afterwards dismantled, been re-established. The Germans did not neglect this precaution, for one of the first cares of Prince Frederick Charles was to establish bridges by means of which one part of his army could rapidly be brought to the threatened point. As to the commanding positions occupied by the enemy on the left bank of the Moselle, that argument did not apply to the other bank, where the contending forces were on a level. As we have shown, moreover, if Bazaine had attacked the Germans with from 100,000 to 120,000 men, he could have still spared a sufficient force to temporarily hold the works defending the intrenched camp. As to the losses of the French army, the Germans had also suffered heavily, especially in superior officers, many of their battalions being commanded by captains. The French army was animated by a high spirit, wished for nothing better than to fight, and had no need of being nursed. Bazaine certainly left nothing to chance, for by remaining passive he rendered it a certainty that it must surrender when it had consumed all its provisions, which were diminishing at a rapid rate. In short, it is plain that Bazaine had no intention of breaking out, and merely made the most specious excuses he could think of for his inaction.

Having thus shown what was his plan, we will now show how he carried it out. On September 22 and 23 there were small sorties for the sake of obtaining food. On the 27th

the operations were on a more extended scale, three army corps being engaged in the affair, which however was of little moment, only a small portion of the force present being actually thrown into the fight. On October 1 there was a sortie on a small scale, and another on the 2nd. On October 7 there was a sharp engagement at Ladonchamp in which three corps took part, but the 6th corps, under Marshal Canrobert, was chiefly engaged. The loss of the French was 1,195 of all ranks, that of the Germans 1,730. According to Canrobert this operation was ill-judged and profited nothing, there being no provisions left to carry away. This was the last proof of valour that this gallant army was allowed to give. From that date till the capitulation Bazaine allowed his troops to slowly starve without an effort to free themselves.

It is true that he, during the last few weeks of the blockade, pretended to contemplate the possibility of cutting his way out, and for this purpose assembled his corps commanders. The very evening of the combat of Ladonchamp, which, according to M. Véron, Bazaine had ordered perhaps to show that his army was not as helpless as the enemy might believe, 'he wrote to the officers commanding army corps, and to the chiefs of special arms, requiring them, after consulting with their generals of division, to give an opinion on the state of affairs within forty-eight hours.' Marshal Canrobert, in his evidence before the court-martial, said that his opinion and that of his generals of division was that 'the army was in a state to sell its life dearly, but not to keep the field as an army.' This, he declared, was likewise the opinion of all the commanders of army corps. They expressed this view at the council of war held on October 10. Marshal Canrobert, when giving his evidence, added, 'It was not a question of a capitulation; no one thought of it at that time; it was only a question of a convention.' In the report of the court of enquiry we find the substance of the written opinions of the corps commanders, and sometimes their very words. Marshal Canrobert said that his generals of division,—

'considering the superior forces of the enemy, considering the fruitless attempts made to quit the lines, considering the almost total destruction of the artillery and cavalry horses, considering the complete exhaustion of provisions—thought that there was cause to treat for an honourable convention—that is to say, to march out with arms and baggage under the condition of not serving against Germany during a time not exceeding a year; in case the conditions imposed

by the enemy should not be such as could be accepted by men of honour, they were resolved to pass through the lines of the enemy, cost what it might.'

He added that no attempt to obtain a convention should be made as long as provisions lasted. Marshal Lebœuf in his letter admitted that the situation was serious.

'The cavalry was,' he said, 'on the point of disappearing; the artillery was already reduced to such a state that it could not horse its parks. . . . We believe that by concentrating our efforts on a portion of the enemy's lines, we have chances to obtain a success which would safeguard the honour of the flag. . . . We do not, however, deceive ourselves as to the difficulties of the enterprise. . . . The generals of the 3rd corps and I, however, are of opinion that we ought, nevertheless, to try the fortune of war. The *morale* of the officers and that of the soldiers are equal to the circumstances, and the army may be called upon to make a new and great effort, presenting to it a well-defined objective for this decisive struggle.'

General Ladmirault, after calling attention to the exhausted state of the insufficiently fed horses of the cavalry, the artillery, and the administration, continued to express his views in the following words:—

'Only the infantry remains sufficiently solid, but it is alone, and deprived of the supports indispensable to it in action. Without a park to follow it, it cannot renew the ammunition which it exhausts so rapidly. Its men having been subjected to a reduced diet could no longer execute those rapid marches which place great distances between them and the enemy. . . . Under any circumstances, your excellency may be sure of finding among the troops of the 4th army corps the most energetic devotion to try and carry out the supreme resolutions which you may deem it suitable to take.'

General Desvaux, commanding the guard since the departure of General Bourbaki, expressed an opinion that 'any attempt to open a way through the hostile army, already attempted without success, was less practicable than ever with a cavalry become powerless.' He advocated 'the prolongation of the defence of Metz to the last limits possible, when food came near its end to ascertain the conditions which the enemy would be disposed to impose, and if the honour of the army was to suffer from it to sally out fighting.'

General Frossard, commanding the 2nd army corps, considered that there were only two courses to be adopted in order to extricate the army from the situation in which it was placed: to try and open a passage sword in hand; or to conclude with the commander of the enemy's forces a con-

vention permitting the French army to issue regularly constituted and armed, on condition of not taking part in the war during a certain time. General Frossard believed in the possibility of success for the first day, but the second day, the enemy having had time to concentrate, success would be doubtful. Even if, however, the French were successful also on the second day, a disaster on the third day would be certain, considering that the artillery teams were too much starved to drag the guns. As to Metz, he did not think that it could hold out for eight days after it had lost the support of the army—and, being an engineer officer, his opinion necessarily carried weight with it. Under these circumstances General Frossard and his generals of division advocated the conclusion of a convention which should allow the army to issue with arms and baggage, and be in a position to safeguard social order. They considered that this convention should be entered into at once, in order that the soldiers might not be discouraged by famine, and that there might remain some horses capable of drawing the guns.

General Coffinière, commanding engineer and commandant of Metz, was of opinion that an attempt to force a way out would cause the destruction of the army; for it would be surrounded by hostile forces at a great distance, would be without cavalry, artillery, without an objective, and without lines of operations. He added that the provisions of the army would not last beyond the 16th, and those of the place beyond the 20th, and that the town could not hold out longer than eight days after the departure of the army.

On October 10 there was a council of war. Marshal Bazaine began by tracing the situation, going on to say that in spite of all his efforts he had been unable to place himself in communication with the capital, that no official news had reached him from the Government, and that there was no indication of any diversion in favour of the army of Metz by a French army outside. General Coffinière and the intendant-in-chief were then invited to state what were the remaining resources in the way of food. The picture was gloomy indeed. A certain amount of meat could be obtained by sacrificing all the horses, but even with a reduced ration the bread would not hold out beyond the 20th. It was finally settled that, first, the army should remain at Metz as long as possible; secondly, that offensive operations, being useless, should cease; thirdly, that negotiations for a convention should be opened within forty-eight hours; fourthly, that in case the enemy should seek to impose conditions

incompatible with the honour and military duty of the army, an attempt should be made to force a passage. This decision was unanimously adopted.

The following reflections suggest themselves: The marshal did not mention that to all appearance the attempt at negotiation through Regnier, Bourbaki, Boyer, and the Empress had failed. His lieutenants might therefore hope that by the course they were adopting they were promoting the interests of the imperial dynasty, and increasing the chances of a definitive treaty of peace. He also kept silence concerning the store of provisions at Thionville and Longwy, of the existence of which he was nevertheless aware. The army was of more importance than the city of Metz, but if during the seven weeks of the blockade the fortifications had not been improved to such an extent as to render a long and regular siege necessary before it could be taken, either General Coffinière had neglected his duty, or the art of fortification was an illusion. Had Generals Coffinière and Frossard of the engineers, and the other officers present, many of whom had served in the Crimea, no recollection of what Todleben had done to increase the strength of Sebastopol even after the besiegers had broken ground? As to an attempt to cut their way through the besiegers' lines, we are ready to admit that it had become almost impossible at that time, owing to the weakness of the men, the number of horses which had died or been killed for food, and the exhaustion of those which survived. It certainly had been feasible up to the end of September. One thing, however, seems to have been lost sight of, viz. that though an attempt to reach Thionville, 18½ miles from Metz, presented few chances of success on October 10, there was still another means by which the valour and high spirit of the French soldiers, shown so conspicuously as lately as October 7, might have been turned to account. What rendered an attempt to force a way to Thionville almost a desperate undertaking? The opposition offered by the Germans within a few thousand yards of the camps of the different French corps. Had Bazaine resolved to give battle on the line itself of investment, and to try to shatter the German army by hard fighting, the siege would have been raised and the obstacle above mentioned removed. For such a battle the teams of the guns could have been reduced, the ammunition carried on the person would have sufficed, and baggage and knapsacks might have been left in Metz. With proper precautions, the French would always

have been superior at the decisive point during at least twenty-four hours.

Continuing now the melancholy narrative of the last few days of the blockade: Bazaine despatched General Boyer to Versailles after the close of the council of war of the 10th, and he returned on the 17th. On the 18th Bazaine held another council, in order that General Boyer might give an account of his mission. Boyer stated that, as a preliminary condition to allowing the army to quit Metz, Bismarck required that the army of Metz should pronounce in favour of the regency, that at the same time the Empress-regent should issue a manifesto calling on the nation to declare the form of government which it desired, and that a delegate of the regency should accept the bases of a treaty between the regency and the German powers.

M. Véron comments thus on the conduct of the marshal:—

He ‘avoids mention of the information brought by General Boyer on the political and military situation of France, as at the meeting itself he took care to say nothing which might enlighten his lieutenants as to the falseness of this information. It was, however, the principal point. It is evident that if the generals whom he consulted had known that France, far from giving up the contest, as was said, was full of ardour and patriotism, and was preparing in every direction for a struggle *à outrance*, some of them would have rejected with horror the idea of treating with an enemy whose victory was not yet certain. Bazaine knew that better than any one, and it is precisely why he left them in ignorance of all that could stimulate them to an energetic resistance. To cover or diminish his responsibility it was necessary that they should appear to associate themselves with his machinations, and to force their will he made them believe that the combination which he proposed to them was the only possible issue from a situation absolutely desperate not only for the army of Metz but for the whole of France. His falsehood had all the success which he could desire. The most energetic renounced the idea of a sortie which could only end in a useless disaster, since France, they were told, no longer even thought of defending herself.’

The result was that by six votes to two it was declared that Boyer should proceed to the Empress.

On the 24th Bazaine received from Bismarck a letter in which, pretending that none of the indispensable guarantees had been given, he practically closed the negotiations. The marshal, on receiving this letter, sent General Changarnier to Prince Frederick Charles

‘to demand the neutralisation of the army and the territory which it occupies, with a local armistice permitting the necessary revictualling, and to offer to appeal to the deputies, and the powers constituted in

virtue of the constitution of May 1870, to treat for peace between the two Powers. In case the first article should not be accepted, the general was to ask that the army should be interned at some place in French territory, to fulfil there the same mission of keeping order. Finally, if he could obtain nothing, he was to demand, in the conditions of a capitulation rendered necessary by the want of food, that the army should be sent to Algeria.'

As might have been expected, Changarnier's mission failed, and there was nothing left but to capitulate. General De Cissey was sent to the chief of the German staff to ask what terms would be granted in the event of a capitulation, which was not to include the surrender of the town of Metz. He was told that the terms would be the same as those granted to MacMahon, and that the fate of the town could not be separated from that of the army. This answer was communicated to a council of war assembled on the 26th. The officers present discussed the clauses of the protocol brought back by General de Cissey, in order to see if some means could not be discovered for obtaining rather better terms. General Jarras, chief of the staff, was then ordered to meet the German chief of the staff, with authority to fix and sign the terms of the convention, as the French persisted in calling it, though it was really a capitulation. Before starting, General Jarras had an interview with the marshal, and received certain instructions. Just before this interview the intendant-general came in, exclaiming, 'Good news, 'I have found bread for four days!' but the marshal did not seem to attach any value to this important intelligence. One would have thought that he would have instructed General Jarras to drag out the negotiations, for, as the French regulations say, the commandant of a place 'is not to lose sight of the fact that on the advancement or 'delay of surrender by a single day may depend the salvation 'of the country.' As we shall show presently, a delay of a few days would have greatly increased the chances of success of the army of the Loire. When General Jarras met General Stiehle, the former was about to discuss the principal clauses of the protocol, but was stopped by the latter, who said that all these had been settled by Generals Changarnier and de Cissey, and that General Jarras had only to draw up under the form of a convention the articles contained in the protocol which General de Cissey had taken to the French headquarters. A discussion then arose 'as to 'certain concessions, especially permission to the French 'officers to retain their swords.' General Stiehle was,

however, immoveable, alleging the positive orders of the king. On this General Jarras said that he must return to the marshal for fresh instructions. General Stiehle then proposed that, to save time, the articles on which there was no dispute should be drawn out, and produced his 'full powers.' General Jarras had designedly left his behind, in order to have, if necessary, an excuse for deferring the signature of the capitulation. He, however, said, 'However, I am very strongly of opinion that my signature would have been accepted the same evening if I had consented to give it; it was easy to see that the enemy were anxious to have done with the army of Metz.' We have italicised the latter part of the paragraph, for it is of considerable importance.

Eventually it was decided that the question of officers' swords should be referred to the King, while as regarded the army as a whole two alternative clauses, one termed the German refused this concession, the other termed the French granted it. At 3 A.M. on the 27th this long conference ended, and General Jarras left with an understanding that he was to return that day at 5 P.M. Between 8 and 9 A.M. General Jarras saw the marshal and reported what had taken place. The marshal approved of General Jarras' conduct, and accepted the offer to march out with the honours of war. The same day at 1 P.M. arrived a letter from General Stiehle granting permission to the officers to retain their swords and to the army the honours of war. To his intense astonishment the marshal declined to accept the *défilé*—the marching past—though that is the essential part of the 'honours of war.' General Jarras remonstrated, but without effect, the marshal saying that he did not refuse the honours of war, but only the *défilé*. He ended by saying that perhaps the matter might be arranged by accepting in the convention the article in question, but agreeing verbally that it should not take place. It is difficult to understand Bazaine's conduct; indeed it is incomprehensible that a general should refuse a public testimony to the estimation in which he and his army were held by the victorious enemy. The marshal, in his defence, pretends that he was afraid that a collision might take place between his troops and those of the enemy. The excuse is ingenious, but we cannot accept it, and are ourselves of opinion that Bazaine was afraid of an insult or an injury to himself. He knew that he was hated and despised, and wished to consummate his baseness as unostentatiously as possible. This was also the opinion of the prosecution. As to the proposal that the 'honours of war'

should be granted in writing, but that the concession should not be accepted in fact, it is characteristic of the marshal's cunning yet shallow mind, and is one more proof of how little he was actuated by feelings of honour, and is worthy of the man who, when commanding in Mexico, established in the capital of that country a shop where goods which by a fraudulent manœuvre had not paid customs duties were sold for his profit.

During the interview above mentioned the marshal instructed General Jarras to inform General Stiehle that it was the custom of the French army after a revolution to destroy the colours which had been given them by the superseded Government. He added that it was in his knowledge that some colours had already been burnt. Jarras remonstrated, but Bazaine persisted.

On reaching the German headquarters, to the surprise of General Stiehle, Jarras refused the *défilé*, and made the communication concerning the colours. General Stiehle plainly showed that he did not believe Bazaine's story, and rejected the proposal that there should be a verbal understanding at variance with the written clause about the honours of war. He expressly stated that the Germans exacted the delivery of all the colours at that moment existing. Finally, in the course of the night, the capitulation was signed, and General Jarras made his report to the marshal on the following morning very early. The council of war was at once assembled, and soon separated, after approving what General Jarras had done. On leaving the council Colonel Nugues, of the staff, informed General Jarras that the preceding evening—i.e. the 27th—he had received from the marshal orders to draw up a circular letter to the commanders of army corps instructing them to send their colours to the arsenal that they might be burnt. But that afternoon a letter was received from General Stiehle insisting on the colours not being destroyed and asking the number remaining. The marshal ordered a reply to be written saying that no colours had been burnt since the signature of the capitulation, that the number which remained was about forty-one, and that they had been deposited at the arsenal. The end of the story of the colours, apparently of little importance to civilians, but highly interesting to soldiers, was as follows: The order to the general commanding the artillery to instruct the director of the arsenal to burn the colours was never written. On the contrary the general commanding the artillery, on the 27th, wrote in the name of the com-

mander-in-chief of the army to the director of the arsenal directing him to receive and preserve the colours. 'They will form part of the inventory of the *matériel* of the place, which will be drawn up by a commission of French and Prussian officers.' Fortunately some generals and colonels took the matter into their own hands and destroyed their colours themselves. It is plain that the marshal never intended that the colours should be burnt, and he was the more determined to preserve them for the enemy when General Stiehle informed him that if the number of colours given up did not appear sufficient none of the clauses of the convention should be observed. He hoped by his complaisance probably to secure better personal treatment from the Germans.

At noon on October 29 the capitulation was carried into effect, the marshal having on the previous day issued an order of the day beginning: 'Vanquished by famine, we are obliged to undergo the laws of war in constituting ourselves prisoners.' That the army was reduced to great extremity when it surrendered is undeniable; but we will proceed to ascertain, first, whether by the adoption of proper measures its misery during the blockade could not have been alleviated; secondly, whether it could not, in spite of the little care taken to husband resources, have yet held out a few days longer. To go minutely into the matter would take up too much space. We shall therefore deal summarily with this subject. The report of the court of enquiry is very instructive. Marshal Bazaine can only be considered fairly responsible for the provisioning of Metz from the date of his return to that town after the battle of Gravelotte. From that time, though the blame may be divided between him and General Coffinière, the commandant, the responsibility must rest, nevertheless, full on the marshal. There were five steps which it was incumbent on him to take: (1) to collect from the neighbourhood all the food and forage which could be found, (2) to regulate the distribution of food among the civil population and prevent waste, (3) to get rid while there was yet time of useless mouths, (4) to establish a rigorous search in the town and suburbs for private stores, (5) to reduce the rations to the smallest amount compatible with health. There was an abundance of food and forage at first between the town and the enemy's lines, and no lack of carriage. In the valley of the lower Moselle the granaries and barns were bursting with the recent harvest. The marshal could have made use of his

numerous cavalry for nearly a week to forage in this district, for only on the 22nd did the German cavalry begin to watch, and it was not occupied seriously for some days later. The Germans profited by the opportunity which the French neglected.

Nor was the marshal only guilty of not collecting as much food and forage as he could. What was collected was not economised. Not till October 12 was the committee of superintendence of siege provisions required by the regulations appointed. Again, the civil inhabitants, 70,000 in number, were not placed on rations till October 14, and then only in consequence of the protests of some officers of the national guard. As to the troops, for want of due supervision and proper regulations, they, especially the officers, bought up at a high price much of the bread in the town. Horses were in many cases fed with bread, and there were frequent instances of ammunition bread being exacted by men who had bought white bread in the town. From September 12 till October 8 the horses of the army were fed on wheat by the marshal's order. Yet on the latter date he issued an order which read as if the practice had been unauthorised. It is true that there was little else to give the poor animals, but of what avail to keep them alive if he had determined not to cut his way out? It would have been wiser, as well as more humane, to have slaughtered all but a very few, and to have fed these few properly. Bazaine had, however, always in his mind the hope of being allowed to quit Metz with his army in order to play a political part.

Evidently, whatever happened, it was of the utmost importance to reduce the rations of the men to what was strictly necessary for the preservation of health. What the marshal actually did was the following. From August 26 he reduced the rations from the extraordinary field to the ordinary allowance, and further reductions followed. In the report of the court of enquiry it is stated that, leaving out of consideration the increase of resources which would have been the result of ordinary energy and forethought, and taking account only of the food that was actually available, the result of a judicious economy from September 2 would have been a gain as regards bread of 34 days. As to meat, if from September 2 only those animals destined for the butcher had been fed there would have been an equal gain. Thus the army and the civil inhabitants would have been provided with food up to November 29 inclusive. It is, moreover, asserted that at the close of the siege a substan-

tial amount of food hidden by individuals was produced. General Coffinière, commandant of the town, in a proclamation addressed to the civil population, said that the capitulation might be deferred four or five days, but the delay would be useless. M. Véron on this point expresses himself with justifiable indignation—

‘Useless, a prolongation of resistance for four or five days when they knew that on all sides there were being organised new armies, for which the question of days might be vital!—when General Jarras stated that the Prussians were so anxious to finish that on the evening of the 26th, in spite of the impossibility of presenting his “full powers” which he had forgotten, his signature would have been accepted immediately if he had consented to give it!—when the army of the Loire, already sufficiently strong to defeat the Prussians ten days later at Coulmiers, could hope to succeed in raising the blockade of Paris if the 200,000 men of Prince Frederick Charles had been retained in front of Metz one week longer!’

What would have been the result of a week gained for the French it is of course impossible to say, but we can certainly affirm with confidence that the chances of success of the army of the Loire would have been largely increased. So critical, indeed, did the state of affairs appear to the Germans, that after the victory of Coulmiers the German headquarter staff at Versailles kept their *fourgons* packed for several days. Their fears would have been indeed well founded had Bazaine not only continued his resistance till November 29, but by continued sorties to a short distance convinced Prince Frederick Charles that all his men and efforts were needed. But thanks either to the carelessness of Bazaine with regard to spies or to private correspondence with the prince, the latter knew well how matters stood, and six days before the capitulation the latter was well aware that only a few days’ more food remained in Metz. The proof of this knowledge is afforded by the fact that as early as October 24 a portion of the investing force was allowed to commence their march to the west, and that on the 24th General Stiehle had shown General Changarnier a train of provisions. ‘These,’ said the chief of the German staff, ‘are provisions which I have caused to come for your famished army.’ But Prince Frederick Charles knew well from the missions of Regnier and Bourbaki, as well as from Bazaine’s attitude, that the marshal, provisions or no provisions, had no intention of quitting Metz save with the concurrence of the Germans. This was even then suspected in the French army. Colonel d’Audlan, in a letter to the

‘*Indépendance Belge*,’ thus describes a curious incident of the siege:—

‘Many sagacious spirits divined the evil at the beginning; many brave hearts wished to anticipate it, and I tell you that it is an honour for me to have been one of the authors of the conspiracy which was formed in the first days of October, to force Bazaine to march or resign. Generals Aymard, Courcy, Clinchant, Péchot, Colonels Boissonnet, Lewal, Davoust, d’Audlan, and I—we wished with all our strength to get out of the *impasse* to which we were being precipitated, and which the others did not see, or did not wish to see. . . . But we had need of a leader, a general of division, whose name and seniority would have rallied round us the army with which we should have arrested the chiefs. Well, not one would take this responsibility; not one had heart enough to put himself forward to save, at the same time, the army and France. Ah, they are very culpable, both the generals and the marshals, and they will have a strict account to give to history, and perhaps the tribunals!’

General Changarnier was one of those asked by General Clinchant and his friends to put himself at the head of the movement. He declined to take any part in the affair, calling those moving in it traitors, and saying, ‘I would sooner the army perish than see it saved by indiscipline.’

Of course it is a dangerous doctrine that officers should constitute themselves judges of the conduct of their commander-in-chief, and, convicting him without formal trial, depose him from his command. This was, however, a special case not to be judged by ordinary rule. The salvation of the army depended on the action of the army, and it was manifest that the marshal, who had let slip so many opportunities of using the army with effect, was not likely to change his course when the favourable chances of success had largely diminished. His conduct was due either to treason or incapacity; that was clear. It was, therefore, in our opinion the duty of the army to place at its head some one in whose loyalty, courage, and ability it had confidence.

To return to the capitulation. By it were surrendered to the Germans 173,000 officers and men, including the garde mobile, the francs-tireurs, and the douaniers, 11,665 pieces of artillery, more than three millions of projectiles, 23,000,000 cartridges, 124,000 chassepots, 150,000 muskets of old pattern, 53 colours, 9,000 limbers and carriages, and a large quantity of powder and other stores. Here again we must interrupt the course of our narrative in order to say a few words about the surrender of the colours and *matériel*. It was clearly Bazaine’s duty, when he determined on a capitulation, to destroy all the colours and all the *matériel* not needed for the last two or three days.

We have related the story of the colours. As to the *matériel* there was a discussion at the council of war on October 24; but it was put an end to by the remark of one of the members, who observed that 'it would be more dignified not to commit any destruction which might give rise to grave disorder.' It is tolerably certain that Bazaine would have evaded a contrary decision. Of course the Germans would have been furious, and would have granted nothing but unconditional surrender; but what would have been the result? The answer is simple. The officers would have been deprived of their swords and personal effects, and the civil population would have been treated with some harshness. Such a price, however, would not have been too high a price to pay for depriving the enemy of the symbols of military honour and a quantity of carriages and stores which were of great value to them.

Bazaine, however, showed himself in every respect egotistical and wanting in sentiments of honour. Throughout the siege he had only thought of personal consequences and objects. He had shut himself up in his quarters, and never visited either the camps or the hospitals. Indeed, he carried his selfishness to such an extent that, once the farewell order written, on October 28, he had taken no steps either to ensure the troops being fed on the 29th, or to secure the proper winding-up of the business of the head-quarter office. He washed his hands of the army altogether, and thought but of placing himself out of reach of the insults and even attacks which he dreaded might be made on him. He had good reason for fear, having been plainly told by one of his officers that he was detested. Writing, therefore, to Prince Frederick Charles to ask permission to present himself at the German headquarters on the morning of the 29th in order to constitute himself a prisoner, he did not even wait for a reply. Setting off at 8 A.M. on the 29th, on the road he met a German officer, who brought him a letter from Prince Frederick Charles, refusing the request which he had made, and intimating that he could not pass the French lines till 5 P.M. on that day or 9.30 A.M. on the 30th. He dared not, however, return to his headquarters, but continued his journey to Moulins, the last village occupied by the French, and there he hid himself in the most remote house. At 4 P.M. he resumed his journey, and crossed the German lines at the village of Ars. He found the inhabitants awaiting his arrival, and, to quote the words of Colonel d'Audlan in his '*Metz, Campagne et Négociations*,' they 'received him with cries, hootings, and hisses. They

‘even threw stones at his carriage; it was necessary for the Prussian gendarmes to rescue the traitor from the indignation of the crowd, and conduct him to Prince Frederick Charles’s quarters at the Château of Compy.’

Thus ended in everlasting shame the military career of the most ignoble soldier who ever received the bâton of Marshal of France. This catastrophe did not take every one by surprise. His conduct in Mexico had been so unprincipled, so rascally in every respect, that it had been even a question at one time of trying him by court-martial. The Emperor could not, however, afford to dispense with the support of one who was undoubtedly personally fearless, was supposed to be well versed in the art of war, was credited with influence in the army, and whose want of scruples rendered him a useful instrument of a despotic government. It was thought that considerations of self-interest would have secured his fidelity; and instead, therefore, of being sent before a court-martial, he became the pet of the fêtes at Compiègne. Unfortunately for the Emperor, unfortunately for France, he saw in the war an opportunity of obtaining supreme political power, and to his unmeasured ambition and sordid greed he sacrificed his master, his army, and his country. That he was guilty of deliberate treason from the time he assumed the command of the army, those who have read this article can scarcely doubt, for he was wanting neither in courage nor military capacity. The proofs alleged against him make it clear that he thought not of defeating or escaping from the enemy, but solely of becoming the arbiter of the fortunes of France. His defence is valueless against the evidence not only of witnesses, but of his own acts and writings. He, in short, convicts himself, and his habitual trickery and his ingrained habits of falsehood render it impossible to accept his own word on any subject. We not only consider the accusation fully proved against him, but we believe that his conduct was even worse than it appeared to be. We have indeed a moral certainty that had it not been for his own cunning and the interested objects of the Germans, the evidence against him would have been much more damning than it was. To those who are charitably disposed to give him the benefit of a doubt, to attribute his inaction at Metz to either want of energy or to a feeling of loyalty towards the Emperor, we will put a single question, with which we shall conclude this article: Assuming that he had guilty designs, could he have set more systematically to work to carry them out than he did?

- ART. II.—1. *Manual of Injurious Insects and Methods of Prevention*. By ELEANOR A. ORMEROD, F.M.S. London: 1882.
2. *Guide to Methods of Insect Life*. By ELEANOR A. ORMEROD, F.M.S. London: 1885.
3. *First Annual Report on the Injurious and other Insects of the State of New York*. By J. A. LINTNER, State Entomologist. Albany: 1882.
4. *Compte-rendu des Travaux du Service du Phylloxera*. Ministère de l'Agriculture. Paris: 1885.
5. *Observations sur le Phylloxera et sur les Parasitaires de la Vigne*. Par les délégués de l'Académie, Institut de France. Nos. 1, 2, 3, et 4. 1881–84.
6. *Enquête de l'Académie des Sciences. Phylloxera vastatrix. Recueil des Documents*. 1879.
7. *Farm Insects: being the Natural History and Economy of the Insects injurious to the Field Crops of Great Britain and Ireland*. By JOHN CURTIS, F.L.S. Illustrated. London: 1883.

IN the happy balance between the energies of nature and the industry of man which is an outcome of long-established civilisation, we are apt to overlook the mighty forces that are at times developed by some of the smallest species of living creatures. Partly owing to the peculiarities of our climate, partly to our insular position, and partly to other causes, we are inclined to hear of insect ravages as if we owned a charmed safety from such attacks. But the experience of to-day in both the new and the old world recalls the memory of devastations recorded in the earliest histories.

‘The Rocky Mountain locust in its migratory flights hides the sun and fills the air as far as the eye can reach. From the highest peaks of the Sierra Nevada it has been seen filling the valleys below and the air above as much higher as they could be distinguished with a good field glass. Rich and fertile portions of the Southern United States are incapable of cultivation from the hosts of mosquitoes that abound in them. The same insect effectually shuts out portions of British America from exploration; while in Eastern Europe and in Asia the attacks of its host have caused insanity in travellers, and the death of domestic animals unprovided with means of defence.’*

* First Annual Report on Injurious and other Insects, by J. A. Lintner, State Entomologist, New York, 1882, p. 14.

In the pastures and meadows of New York in 1881 an insect suddenly appeared in such countless numbers as to excite general consternation. There was a well-founded apprehension that not only pastures, but every lawn and every grass-plot would be invaded by the small green caterpillar known as the army worm. The dull yellow moth, which is the perfect form of this insect, measures one inch over its expanded wings, which are fringed with a golden reflection. It belongs to the family of the *Pyralidæ*, already infamous for their attacks on the vine. The poverty of the yield of the Russian corn crops, which has sunk from the rate of 8.3 bushels per acre in 1875 to that of 5.1 bushels per acre in 1883, is ascribed to the ravages of the swarms of insects that are fostered by the absence of deep ploughing and the want of careful cultivation of the soil. The hordes of the Colorado potato beetle, when the value of Paris green as an insecticide was first discovered, 'were invading and threatening the entire ruin of every potato field throughout the Northern and Middle United States east of the Rocky Mountains, and southward into North Carolina and Northern Texas.' As to the microscopic yellow aphid that has actually destroyed in ten years two and a half millions of acres of vineyards in France, we have been led by the great economic importance of the subject, and by the absence of information from English sources, to reproduce a brief outline of its invasion. Nor is our own immunity from such foes an established fact. In 1835 the destruction of the turnip crop effected by the caterpillar of the turnip saw-fly extended as far north as Durham; and in the southern counties, from Somerset to Kent, the crop was a failure, the second and even the third sowing being devoured by these "niggers."* †

'The damages to hop planters occasioned by the Hop Aphid have been almost incalculable. Hop plants have been liable to its attacks for at least two hundred years. It appears from the records of these attacks—black blights—that they have been of more frequent occurrence during the last fifty years. It would be difficult to give accurate estimates of the losses to hop planters and to the whole community caused by the ravages of aphides. In the last serious blight, in 1882, not a hop was picked in many important hop-growing parishes; and it was estimated that the whole produce of the hop land in England (65,619 acres in 1882) did not exceed 114,839 cwt., or an average yield of $1\frac{3}{4}$ cwt. per acre. The annual average yield of the English plantations is about 7 cwt. per acre.' †

* Manual of Injurious Insects, p. 164.

† Reports of the Agricultural Department, C. 4534. 1885.

Thus the injury inflicted on the hop growers in that year by one of the ten different genera of insects that attack the hop amounted to the value of 2,700,000*l*.

The experience obtained in the United States brings out into strong relief both the danger to which man is exposed from the undue development of insects that prey upon his food, and the importance of the remedies which patient study has enabled men of science to suggest. 'The excessive ravages of insects in the United States are largely owing to the cultivation of their food plants in extended areas.' Two hundred years ago not even the wild crab existed in America, and consequently there were no apple insects. The introduction of the fruit tree from Europe has been accompanied by that of some of its natural parasites.

'In the apple orchards of the present day, some of them spreading in an almost unbroken mass of foliage over hundreds of acres, our numerous apple insects may find the thrifty root, the vigorous trunk, the succulent twig, the tender bud, the juicy leaf, the fragrant blossom, and the crisp fruit, spread out before them in broad array as if it were a special offering to insect voracity, or a banquet purposely extending an irresistible invitation to the tent-caterpillar, the codling-moth, the canker-worm, the striped borer, the bark-beetle, the twig-borer, the leaf-aphis, the bark-louse, the root-louse, and every other of our one hundred and sixty species of apple insects. Here they may luxuriate as nowhere else. The required food is greatly in excess of insect need. Careful cultivation has made it the best of its kind; appetite is stimulated; development is hastened; broods are increased in number; individuals are multiplied beyond the conservation of parasitic destroyers; facilities of distribution are afforded with hardly a proper exercise of locomotive organs; and when these almost useless members have become aborted, as in the wingless females of the bark-louse (*Mytilaspis pomicorticis*) and the canker-worm (*Anisopteryx vernata* and *A. pometaria*) the interlocking branches afford convenient passage from tree to tree.' *

In a word, these extensive and unbroken areas devoted to the culture of individual crops form so many nurseries for the insects which feed on them. Thus there is an apple orchard near Hudson, in the State of New York, covering 300 acres, and containing 26,000 apple trees. The peach orchard at Orchard Hill, Georgia, contains 54,000 peach trees and occupies 540 acres. A fruit grower in California has 1,010 acres of grape vines, estimated to produce, when in full bearing, 4,000,000 pounds of muscat raisins. A cotton

* First Annual Report of the Entomologist of the State of New York, p. 11.

plantation near Albany contained, in 1872, 6,500 acres of cotton; a farm in Nebraska, 12,000 acres of oats and 24,000 acres of wheat. Three wheat fields in the San Joaquin valley in California contained respectively 17,000, 23,000, and 36,000 acres. A potato field in Colorado is 150 acres in extent, and its yield is estimated as from 25,000 to 30,000 bushels. A million quarts of strawberries were raised in Dighton, Massachusetts, in 1877. The general tendency of agriculture in America is towards the cultivation of special crops on a scale only limited by the means of handling them; and the result, unless adequate means be taken for the protection of these crops from the enemies which they at the same time invite and nourish, would be the ultimate extinction of agriculture itself.

The damage actually caused by insects has been carefully estimated as regards different crops. They often, says Mr. Lintner, injure crops to the extent of one-fourth or one-half, and occasionally entirely destroy them. During the ravages of the wheat midge (*Diplosis tritici*) in 1854, 1857, whole fields were left unharvested, including 2,000 acres in Livingston county which ought to have yielded 30 bushels per acre. The loss incurred in the wheat crop of New York alone in 1854, from the wheat midge, was estimated at 3,000,000*l*. In Ohio, during the same year, the loss was even more. In 1854 the same insect destroyed 8,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada. 'The cash value of the wheat and corn destroyed in the year 1864 in the State of Illinois by the chinch-bug is estimated at 73,000,000 dollars.' The same insect injured the corn in Missouri in 1874 to the amount of 19,000,000 dollars.

The American wheat midge (*Cecidomyia destructor*, Say) is, like the phylloxera, an importation from the United States, where it is called the Hessian fly, from the circumstance that it was thought to have been introduced in the fodder of the Hessian troops. In its perfect form it is a delicate fly, somewhat smaller than the common gnat. Its body is covered with small black hairs, the breast is of a golden yellow. The larvæ are of a pale green colour, with a black dot above; they do not exceed two lines in length. The insect differs from its congeners, the British wheat midge and the barley midge, chiefly in the habits of the larvæ, which live in society, forming a sort of nest between the straw and the sheath, at the first joint above the crown of the root of the wheat plant. They consume the sap; causing the ears to droop, and the stem to bend, until in a few days the plants become entangled and matted together,

as if driven by heavy rain; the ears become abortive, the few grains they contain shrivel, and the straw is of a very bad quality. Its ravages have at times been such as to cause actual famine. The locality selected by the insect in its attack on the plant is such as to render it easy to destroy by any insecticide which, like a duly proportioned solution of iron, is not injurious to the plant. It is stated in a letter of the Chairman of the Seeds and Plant Diseases Committee of the Royal Agricultural Society, that this fearful scourge has made its appearance in England.

The ravages of the Rocky Mountain locust in the States of Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and Missouri, in 1874, were computed to cost nearly 56,000,000 dollars. The annual damage inflicted by the cotton-worm (the larva of a moth, *Aletia argillacea*) in the fourteen years prior to 1878, in nine of the principal cotton States, is estimated at 6,000,000*l*. While the total public revenue of the United States in the year 1882 was 524,000,000 dollars, the annual value of the agricultural produce consumed by insects has been estimated at the lowest at 200,000,000, and by Mr. R. D. Walsh at 300,000,000, dollars.

In face of so great a danger—a danger which entomologists consider to be on the increase in the United Kingdom as well as elsewhere—it is obvious that an exhaustive knowledge of the species, nature, and life history of the most formidable insect commensals of man is of primary importance. Insect life, unlike that of the larger animals, goes through a cycle of almost infinite variety. The beautiful and sportive forms of the flying insects not only attract admiration from the exquisite finish of their adornment, but claim our sympathy as the sportive denizens of a summer hour, to which no one can grudge a few drops of honey; and yet some of these creatures, which, in certain species, in their final state have not even a mouth, or any digestive apparatus, are but the carriers of the eggs from which issue the overwhelming hordes of the army worm, the wheat midge, and the phylloxera. The acquisition of this special knowledge is of recent development. In England the useful works of Miss Ormerod popularise and add to the information first brought together in the 'Farm Insects' of Mr. J. Curtis, of which a new edition is illustrated by numerous woodcuts, and by sixteen exquisitely drawn and coloured engravings on steel. The 'Enquête de l'Académie des Sciences' into the history of the *Phylloxera vastatrix*, published in 1879, forms two thick quarto volumes, illustrated by maps and by exquisite engra-

wings. Four series of 'Observations sur le Phylloxera' have been issued by the Institut de France, containing anatomical engravings of the creature, highly magnified, of the beauty of which it is difficult to speak too highly; and the Ministère de l'Agriculture publishes an annual 'Compte-rendu des Travaux du Service du Phylloxera.'

The winged insects, with the tribes of which man is best acquainted, pass ordinarily through four successive and very dissimilar forms. The first is that of the egg, which, as in the cases of birds and of fishes, is usually very small in proportion to the size of the mature animal, and which is generally endowed with the power to resist, to a great extent, the effect of changes of temperature, and the wear and tear attendant on the culture and growth of plants. The second stage is that of the larva, comprehending maggots, caterpillars, grubs, and sometimes more highly developed types of insect life. It is in this stage that the chief growth occurs, stimulated by an insatiable appetite. Recent observations have given some curious details as to the effect of the supply of food in determining the period of time which certain insects pass in the larva state, and even the form in which they leave it. Extraordinary varieties, however, occur in the mode in which various tribes of insects undergo their metamorphoses. The most remarkable anomaly occurs with the *aphis*, that destructive pest, which may be seen covering the buds and leaves of the rose and many other plants with closely packed groups of green, brown, or black plant lice, greedily employed in sucking the juice of the vegetable. These creatures in their perfect state are winged and oviparous. But when once established on a plant, their nature undergoes a change that is an exception to the ordinary course of insect transformations. They bring forth, viviparously, successive generations of wingless pupæ, in agamous or parthenogenetic fashion, as if by internal gemmation rather than by the usual oviparous mode; and when the supply of food waxes short, or under conditions as yet but very imperfectly studied, winged forms suddenly make their appearance, and fly off to colonise and to devastate fresh and distant vegetable homes.

The insect tribes, regarded as commensal with man, possess most interest if classified according to their food. Insects are carnivorous, insectivorous—even cannibal—herbivorous, graminivorous, coprophagous, or omnivorous. Those most dreaded by man, or most deserving to be so dreaded, are not, however, those which prey directly upon him, in common

with other animals, but those which subsist upon his food. Most of the insects that dare to snatch a meal from the juices of the human frame are provided by nature with arrangements that give warning to their victims. The sharp buzz of the mosquito can no more be mistaken than the 'ping' of the rifle bullet. The extreme pain and irritation caused by insect bites arouse the instinct of self-defence, and promote the practice of cleanliness. Of some truly formidable insect parasites, as the Tsetse fly, and the creature known as the Chigo, or Jigger, in tropical climates, the natural history still requires elucidation, and the discovery of a prophylactic has yet to be made. But the annoyance and mischief thus caused, taken at their worst, are as nothing in comparison to the damage effected by the steady devastating march of the countless hordes of the locust, before which everything that is green disappears, and even the fires kindled to arrest the progress of the invaders are extinguished by their swarms. Three times, it is said, the fertile crops raised by the Mormons in their earlier settlements were destroyed by the locusts, and three times were the colonists driven to search for regions less obnoxious to the destroyer.

The action of man in cultivating the soil has an effect on the development or the restriction of insect life which it is of the utmost importance to understand. In unsettled regions a sort of balance has been established, or may be thought to have always existed, between the vigour of the vegetable and that of the animal kingdoms. When man comes on the scene the case is altered. The plentiful crops of root or grain that he raises over broad-spread acres, the mode in which he dries the soil by drainage, or by the destruction of forests, the insensate war which he wages with his natural allies, the insectivorous beasts and birds, the transplantation of vegetables to fresh localities, accompanied very generally with their insect depredators, the depression of the vigour of certain plants by the mode of propagation or of culture—all these things are so intimately connected with the conditions of insect life that the vine grower, the hop grower, the fruit grower, the root grower, or the grain grower who is ignorant of the habits of those creatures which strive to share the result of his tillage is indeed working blindfold.

Butterflies, moths, and hawk moths, harmless and defenceless as they appear in their aerial flight, are among the most formidable enemies to many kinds of vegetables in their larval

state. In England the stately oak is at times injured, over a wide extent of woodland, by the small caterpillars of the *Tortrix viridans*, or oak-leaf roller, which feed on the young and tender leaves so voraciously as to strip the trees, and thus prevent the aeration of the sap and the formation of the annual ring of wood. The parent insect is a small moth about three-eighths of an inch in length, and double that dimension in the spread of its wings. The upper wings are light green, the under of a brown or silver-grey. The caterpillars are hatched, at the time of the unfolding of the young leaves, from eggs laid in the previous year. 'They are at first lead colour,' Miss Ormerod tells us, 'or of a greenish grey. When full-grown they are about half an inch long, of a dull green with dusky spots. They have the power of letting themselves down by silken threads, and may be seen in hundreds swinging in the air from infested trees, until they are either eaten by the birds or return up the thread to the leafage.' About the end of May they roll up the tip of the leaf, and attach it into a sort of tube by their webs, turning to chrysalids in the shelter thus formed. They are at times so numerous as to form a black decaying mass at the foot of the trees when killed by a sudden fall of temperature.

At the opposite end of the scale among English insects may be mentioned the corn wolf moth, the *Tinea granella* of Linnæus. It is about half the size of the leaf roller moth, and has received its name from the ravages committed by its caterpillar on the grains of corn—wheat, barley, oats, and rye—in store. This moth is described by Mr. Curtis as cream-white with a satiny lustre. The caterpillars do incredible mischief to bonded and housed corn laid up in granaries, and are called 'white corn worms.' Leuwenhoek adds that 'these worms are not only destructive to corn, but are also in old timber, books, boxes, woollen stuffs, and the like.' The caterpillars spin a grey web, with which heaps of corn that have not been duly turned over are sometimes covered, the creature there spinning a cocoon in which it rests till called forth by the warmth of the ensuing year.

There can be little doubt that, as was held by Linnæus, every plant, at all events of the dicotyledonous and the monocotyledonous provinces of nature, has its special insect enemy or enemies, its ungrateful guests. Indeed, Mr. Lintner attributes as many as six insect foes to each vegetable species. Among the *Lepidoptera* the otter moth or ghost moth is

destructive to the hop. The eggs, which are laid by night, are so small that they cannot easily be discovered. The larvæ feed on the roots. They are large caterpillars of a dull-yellow colour from 1 to $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch long, or three times the size of the body of the moth. The antler moth, which has upper wings of reddish brown marked by white streaks resembling the antlers of the stag, and with lower wings of a yellowish grey with pale fringes, is a ravager of grass and meadow land, the caterpillar feeding on the shoots as well as upon the roots. The pea moth belongs to the same family (that of the *Tortricidæ*) as the oak-leaf roller. It is of a dusky grey with wings slightly tipped with white. It lays its eggs on the young pods, and the caterpillars pierce the skin, and make their way into the young peas. The caterpillars of the small swift moth feed on the roots of parsnips, lettuce, potato, celery, and strawberry plants, as well as on those of grass, with voracious impartiality. The magpie moth, well known by its white wings spotted with black, is the special foe of the currant and gooseberry bushes, but also attacks in its larval state plums, apricots, and even the sloe and the blackthorn. The vapourer moth, of which the female is wingless, and the caterpillar is studded with bristling tufts of hair, feeds on the leaves of the pear and other fruit trees, but may be found on the hawthorn, on the rose, and other garden plants, and even on the fir. The puss moth infects the willow and the poplar, and its large caterpillar, of a purplish brown streaked with white lines, and ending in two horn-like tails, bores the bark and forms a tough glue-like cocoon to protect its chrysalis. The caterpillars are nearly three inches long. The turnip moths appear early in summer, and the caterpillars hatch in about a fortnight after the eggs are laid. 'Each year,' says Miss Ormerod, 'the damage caused by surface caterpillars becomes more and more plainly shown, both in the extent of their depredations, and in the variety of field crops which they injure to a serious extent, in the spring as much as in the late summer and autumn.'

Mr. Curtis gives full descriptions, illustrated by coloured engravings of much beauty, of the chief insect foes of the farmer, arranged under the head of the crops on which they prey. The caterpillar of the turnip diamond-backed moth, and that of the Y-moth frequently inflict great damage on the turnip crops. Three species of white butterflies injure the turnip and cabbage crops, viz. the white cabbage butterfly, the small white (or turnip) butterfly, and the rape-

seed or green-veined white butterfly. The pale mottled willow moth, the full-bodied wheat moth, and the common Rustic moth come from caterpillars that prey upon the ears and the straw of wheat. A genus of flat-bodied moths gives birth to caterpillars that prey on the blossom and seed of the carrot and the parsnip; and the otter caterpillar of the ghost moth will devour carrots as well as hop roots. The caterpillar of the large death's-head sphinx feeds on the leaves of the potato, and is no longer rare; and that of the heart and dart moth destroys acres of potatoes, attacking the haulm just beneath the earth, and boring into the tubers. A large hairy caterpillar lives on the clover, and produces a fine moth, more than two and a half inches in the spread of its wings, called the grass or corn Egger moth. A very similar species preys on the lucerne; and the Burnet moth and the Shipton moth thrive on the same food. The above insects, which have been especially held up by Mr. Curtis and Miss Ormerod to the detestation of the farmer, are but examples of the enormous demand on the vegetable provender of man and of beast that is made by the young of those graceful insects that are commonly held to live only on the honey of flowers.

The order of insects which from the earliest time has most attracted the sympathy of man is that which contains the most perfect mechanists among the articulate tribes. The mason, the carpenter, the papermaker, the upholsterer have all their fellow-workfolk among the *Hymenoptera*; while the combined efforts of the chemist and of the confectioner fall short of the produce of

‘The singing masons building roofs of gold,
The civil citizens kneading up the honey.’

Whether armed for defence, or implemented for industry, alike perfect in the possession and in the use of the most efficient apparatus—the dagger, the lancet, the saw, the auger, and the trowel—it is in this marvellous group that we find—

‘Creatures that, by a rule in nature, teach
The art of order to a peopled kingdom.’

Happily for larger, if not wiser, creatures than themselves, the *Hymenoptera* contain comparatively few species that prey on human food. Many of them are insectivorous, or carnivorous, and thus act as the allies of man. The *Aphis* that infests the corn, the butterfly whose caterpillar injures the cabbage, the corn saw-fly, the wheat midge, the

corn weevil, and many other species of very destructive insects are each attended by piratical ichneumons, whose activity proves a check on the increase of the vegetable-feeding insect. Not unfrequently the assailant so nearly resembles the size and shape of its prey as to be indistinguishable from it except by a careful observer.

Of this great and gifted order of insects the saw-flies are those most to be redoubted by the English farmer—not, indeed, in the winged condition, but in the larval form, which very closely resembles that of the caterpillar of a moth or butterfly. In 1756 the first appearance of the species of these flies which attacks the turnip in England was recorded. ‘Their mischievous visits,’ says Mr. Curtis, ‘are at extremely irregular intervals. In 1782 many thousands of acres of turnips were entirely destroyed in Norfolk ‘by the black caterpillar of the turnip saw-fly.’ The year 1835 also proved most fatal to this crop from the same cause; the produce of a second and a third sowing being destroyed by the black caterpillar. Wheat, and currants and gooseberries are among the cultivated plants that occasionally are cruel sufferers from the attacks of their appropriate saw-flies. The *Sirex*, or wood-boring sawfly, and the gall-flies, which cause the unnatural growth of vegetable tissue known as galls, belong also to this highly organised order of insects.

In the third order of four-winged insects the intense energy of life is for the most part maintained on animal diet. In very many of the species the larvæ are aquatic, and are thus removed from the category of commensals with man. It is fortunate for us that such is the case, as in the instance of the neuropterous genus known by the misleading name of the white ant the defensive power of man wholly fails to arrest the destruction caused by the insect. Railways are impossible in the regions haunted by the white ant, unless the sleepers are made of metal, or of the wood of one of those few trees which, like the *Sal*, resist the ravages of the insect. In our English experience the insects of this order deserve the gratitude of man, as in the case of the Golden Eye, *Chrysopa perla*, the larvæ of which feed ravenously on aphides.

‘Like the lady birds,’ says Mr. Curtis, ‘these insects begin to feed upon the aphides as soon as they escape from the egg, and from that time are constantly hunting after them, until they change to beautiful flies. . . . They lie in ambush for their prey; but when they are encamped upon a leaf, amongst the sluggish aphides, they seize them

with their long and powerful jaws, and will devour the largest of them in half a minute.'

Unfortunately these *lions des pucerons*, as the French call them, have the drawback of being, by preference, cannibals.

'Two which I found at the end of August,' says the same author, 'on being placed in a box immediately attacked each other, the conqueror making a meal of her companion, and soon after sucking the contents out of a caterpillar three-fourths of an inch long, leaving only the skins.'

The group of insects whose wings, folded, for the most part, when at rest, beneath a horny wing-case, may be regarded as organs of auxiliary, rather than of constant, motion, disputes with the moth and the two-winged fly the bad eminence of successful brigandage on the food of man. Beetles, although some of them are useful as scavengers, are for the most part very destructive to vegetation, both in the state of the grub and in that of the perfect insect. The wire worm, one of the great foes of the English farmer, is the larva of an *Elater*, or click beetle; and where food is abundant is said to continue its subterranean ravages for five years before undergoing transformation. On the other hand, despite his unholy name, and menacing habit of upturning his tail when alarmed, the Devil's Coach-horse, or Rove-beetle, feeds on other insects and on decaying matter. The locust, one of the most irresistible of insect destroyers, is the most formidable genus of the order *Orthoptera*, in which the membranous wings are folded lengthwise beneath the elytra, or wing-cases, instead of transversely, as with the *Coleoptera*, or beetles. Happily for the English farmer, this order is chiefly represented in England by the grasshopper and the cricket. The mole cricket, however, one of the most remarkable forms of insect life, 'sometimes,' says Miss Ormerod, 'does much harm by feeding on roots, both of grass and other plants.' But it is in the last of the six orders, as to the demarcation of which we have preferred the views of Cuvier to the less simple classification of later naturalists, that, by creatures of microscopic size, and of a delicacy of structure which renders destruction easy, the heaviest blow has been dealt on the economy of systematic cultivation that has, as yet, been anywhere reduced to figures.

In the year 1854 Mr. Asa Fitch, the Entomologist of the State of New York, first described a newly-observed insect which produced galls on the leaves of certain American

vines. In 1868 MM. Bazille, Planchon, and Sahut, in a Report to the Agricultural Society of the Hérault, on the new disease of the vine, first referred its origin to the action of an undetermined aphidian, which had been discovered on the roots of the plants. In 1869 Professor J. O. Westwood mentioned, in an interesting article in the 'Gardener's Chronicle,' observations which he had made, in 1863, at Hammersmith, on similar vegetable excrescences, which he attributed to a species of insects akin to the aphids. The habits of the insect, which is of minute size, are so obscure that it has been described under various names by different observers; and it is to a publication made at Montpellier, on the occasion of the thirty-fifth session of the Scientific Congress of France, that we have to attribute the first comprehensive review of the bibliography of the subject, then comprising 484 distinct works, including papers in periodicals; and the final adoption of the specific name of the *Phylloxera vastatrix*.

The phylloxera is an insect of American origin. It has been strenuously debated whether its presence should be regarded as a cause or as an effect of that terrible malady of the vine which has been proved to accompany its appearance. Nineteen authors, cited by MM. Planchon and Lichtenstein, have supported the opinion that it was the failure of the vital energy of the plant which invited the ravages of the insect. In the number of this Journal for October 1875 attention was called to the fact that 'the potato blight and famine, the varied and successive diseases or disasters of the vine, and the progressive extermination of the silkworm by the ravages of the pebrine, an insect epidemic unknown before 1842, each co-exist with a form of culture that is opposed to a very general law of vegetable physiology.' It is a testimony to the truth of this view that the recommendation then given to supply the silkworms with a more pure and healthy diet than could be afforded by the constant stripping of the ill-used mulberry trees has subsequently been so far carried out as to check the rapid deterioration of the silk crop. Where the worm is allowed to feed at will on the tree, protected by a sort of housing from predatory birds, the silk has been found to regain much of its ancient excellence. That the increased delicacy of the flavour of the French grapes has been accompanied by a corresponding loss of the native vigour of the vine, under 1,500 or 2,000 years of artificial cultivation, is shown to be probable by the fact that the vigorous vines of America, which, as cultivated, are less

than a century old, hold their own against their indigenous foe. Even when transported to Europe the vines of the *Æstivalis* type have maintained their immunity from the pest; and the plantation, or the grafting, of this kind of vine has been one of the remedies found useful in the south of France.

Points of this kind, however, have rather a scientific than a practical value in the actual state of the French vineyards. Whether it be that the vine is weakened, or that the food or climate has specially suited the invader, there is no question of the sweeping character of the invasion. Nothing yet attempted seems perfectly to check it. Even the mode in which the insect travels has been doubted, but no doubt can exist when it has once effected a colonisation. Islands of decay—spots of oil they are called, from their mode of spreading from a centre—occur in district after district. The leaves become discoloured and fall; the vine struggles for a season, but its death is certain when once the fatal fly has raised galls on the leaves, and descended to colonise its roots. The most effective simple check that has yet been found is one applicable only in certain rare localities. This is to flood the vineyards, and thus drown the wingless larvæ clustered on the roots. But even this affords no protection against the settlement of the winged fly upon the leaves; and the cases are rare when a vineyard can be flooded.

So different are the forms of the individuals comprised in a single species of the phylloxera that it has taken the combined study of the most patient observers, and the most delicate anatomists, of France, for a period of twenty years, to arrive at a clear and intelligible view of the biological cycle of the insect. The Académie des Sciences published in 1884 the 'Observations sur le Phylloxera' of M. G. Balbiani, which are illustrated by eleven exquisitely finished plates, in which the history of the parasite of the vine is illustrated by comparison with that of another species of the same genus which attacks the oak.

The most striking characteristic of the phylloxera, which that species shares to a great extent with the whole tribe of the *Aphis*, is the decomposition of those functions which are combined in the ordinary animal economy in a pair, into elements represented by many different individuals. In the greater number of the species of winged insects the nutritive functions are chiefly exercised in the larval stage of existence, while the reproductive are confined to the final, or flying, forms. With the phylloxera a similar division is

carried out in a much more complicated manner. The species comprises five different forms, of which four are exclusively agamous, or monosexual, while the fifth alone contains individuals of two sexes. Commencing with the winter egg, the discovery of which in Languedoc was announced to the Académie des Sciences in 1880 by M. Valéry Mayet, the cycle of forms is as follows:—1st, the spring phylloxera, or *mère fondatrice*; 2nd, the ordinary wingless larvæ; 3rd, the winged or emigrant insect; 4th, the wingless larvæ that, like the last-named form, lay male and female eggs; 5th, the diœcious generation, or true males and females. In the production of this wonderful series three distinct kinds of eggs are laid by the insects. The first is the true, or winter egg, produced in the usual manner from male and female parents. The second is the summer egg, produced in great numbers by successive larvæ, and yielding a like monœcious brood. The third is the diœcious egg, laid either by a winged or an apterous mother. Of this egg there are two kinds, that which gives birth to the true female being about one third larger than that producing the male insect. The phylloxera of the oak goes through these stages in a year. But the parasite of the vine, which finds its food at one time on the leaf and at another on the root of the European plant, was determined by M. P. de Laffitte, in 1879, as requiring two years for the accomplishment of its biological cycle.

Thus the spread of this terrible pest has a double starting point, geographical and local. The winged phylloxera, able just to rise in the air, with little or no power of directing its flight, is wafted by the wind from vineyard to vineyard. A series of maps published by the Académie des Sciences in 1879 furnishes the record of these migratory extensions of the field of attack. In 1865 the first appearance of the phylloxera in France occurred in the plateau of Pujant, near Roquemaure, on the right bank of the Rhone. In 1866 the area thus attacked had extended to four or five times the size attained in the preceding year, and had become surrounded by eleven other centres of infection. In 1867 the invasion extended over two large areas of country; one, of which Orange was the centre, reaching to the south of Avignon, and the other in Crau. In 1868 these two regions had united; the malady had extended to the sea on the south, and to Pierrelatte and Grignan on the north, while two outlying spots appeared, one in Le Gard, and one near Montelimart. Year after year tells the same gloomy tale

of spread of main body of infection and increase in the number and area of outlying points. By 1877 a vast irregular triangle, extending from a little westward of Béziers to Fréjus, on the Mediterranean seaboard, and with its apex reaching to Macon on the north, was formed, surrounded by between twenty and thirty outlying plague spots. In 1884, according to the report of M. Tisserand to the Commission Supérieure du Phylloxera, the total destruction of vineyard in fifty-three departments infested by the phylloxera amounted to above 429,000 hectares, or more than a million of acres. The surface existing in those departments before the malady was 2,485,829 hectares; it was reduced at the time of the report to 2,056,713 hectares. The surface occupied by vines that had been attacked, but not yet quite destroyed, was at the same time 664,511 hectares, or about 22,000 more than in the preceding year. Measured by the production of wine, the year 1879 was the most disastrous. The yield of 1874 was 63,000,000 hectolitres. In 1879 it sank to less than 26,000,000, since which it has gradually but irregularly recovered to nearly 35,000,000 in 1884. Mr. Buckton ('British Aphides,' iv. 55) says that the ravage of the phylloxera, 'in 1881, is said to have inflicted on this French industry a loss 'of three milliards of money.' Of course he means of francs.

The spread of the plague, due to the aerial dissemination of the winged individuals of the species, is intensified in its local action by their extraordinary power of multiplication.

'A certain obscurity,' says M. G. Balbiani, one of the latest and ablest systematic writers on the subject, 'still reigns over what we may call the first steps of this insect: Does it first direct itself to the leaves, to lead there an aerial life for some time before burying itself beneath the soil? or does it descend directly into the ground after it is hatched? This is not yet positively known. It seems to be the case that the nature of the variety of vine is not without influence here. The numerous galls with which certain American vines are almost regularly covered in the spring, the appearance of which coincides with the hatching of the winter egg, show that at all events a large number of the young insects, as soon as born, attack the leaves and found colonies of gall-dwellers, which succeed one another through the summer. On the other hand, the extreme rarity of galls on the leaves of our indigenous vines proves that the insects go direct to the roots, and only return to the air at the period of migration.'

Taking the ordinary course pursued by the insect in its native quarters, the winged phylloxera pierces the upper surface of a young leaf, and deposits three or four eggs, around which a purse-shaped gall forms, on the back of the leaf. From these eggs are hatched the male and female

insects, which have neither trunks, mouths, nor internal digestive organs, their whole structure being devoted to the formation and fertilisation of a single egg in each female; a process which exhausts the life of the mother, who is reduced to a shell on the exclusion of the egg. From this, the winter or true egg, issues, about the end of March, the first of the series of agamous larvæ; which in its turn produces a series of generations resembling each other in all respects except in the increasing sterility of each descent. The number of succeeding agamous generations is probably to some extent dependent on the weather. M. Balbiani has observed the deposit of fifty-three eggs by the same insect in twenty days; and reduces the enormous number arrived at by Mr. Curtis on a supposed law of geometric progression to the modest figure of 148,877 individuals, derived in sixty days from a single insect. It is evident that in the course of a year the progeny of a single winged phylloxera might so increase as to affect the vegetation perceptibly by the second year. The whole history of the spread of the insect as recorded on the maps above referred to is thus consistent with the idea that the original invasion of France may have sprung from the transmission from America of a single winter egg, beneath the bark of a vine shoot, and that the sporadic invasions from the centre once established may each have been due to a single emigrant. The mode in which the pest actually spread can, at all events, be thoroughly explained on such an hypothesis.

Two things are clear from the above scheme of the life and manners of the phylloxera: one is, the unparalleled rapidity with which an insect, arriving in a new country, unaccompanied by the natural enemies which tend to limit its numbers in its native abode, and finding a kind of vegetation, remarkably suited to its taste, abundantly open to its ravages, has in point of fact increased; the other is, that there are certain points in the cycle of phylloxera life on which the efforts of defence should be concentrated. If the production of the true egg could be arrested, or if the diœcious insects could be destroyed with, or before producing, the winter egg, the teeming colonies on the roots of the vine would exhaust their reproductive energy, and the race would come gradually to an end.

Thus while the wholesale destruction of the root-dwelling larvæ, if it can be effected without the destruction of the plants, has long engaged the efforts of the Académie des Sciences, the more recent measures adopted for the destruc-

tion of the winter egg are, perhaps, more hopeful for the vine. If, indeed, it be true that the winged insect invariably attacks the leaf, and that the gall thus formed is the true source of infection on each new spot, the value of a careful inspection of the leaves of uninfected vineyards from day to day, and of the immediate destruction of every gall at its first appearance, would be capital. Nor, even in the present state of knowledge on the subject, should such a degree of watchfulness be neglected in any wholly uninfected vineyard.

Here, too, comes in the question, which has hardly yet received the attention it deserves, of prophylactic treatment. If it be possible, as some experiments have at all events indicated, to wash and water the vine plants, when the sap first begins to rise, with any substance fatal or offensive to aphidian life, and harmless, or even beneficial, to vegetation, the first visit of the flying insect might be fenced off. No chemical element, according to a high authority among English chemists, offers so fair a prospect in this direction as iron. The minute germs of organic life, known as *bacteria*, are uninjured by an atmosphere of pure oxygen, of carbonic acid, of nitrogen, of sulphurous acid, and of cyanogen; but, Dr. Frankland says, when brought into contact with water containing a certain dose of metallic iron, they become lifeless forms. The aphides that affect the rose, and other small forms of insect life, are also readily destroyed, either by water charged with metallic iron, or by contact with that metal if they are prevented from escaping from its surface. How far the subterranean forms of the phylloxera can thus be successfully attacked has not, so far as we are aware, been properly tried.

France has risen to resist the scourge with the well-directed energy of a great nation. The Government, the Académie des Sciences, and the local proprietors have each acted with independent initiative, but with combined forces. The Ministry of Agriculture has appointed 'La Commission Supérieure du Phylloxera,' under the presidency of M. Pasteur. The Académie des Sciences has instituted an *enquête* on the subject, and has published annual collections of observations, some of which are illustrated by admirable plates. The 'Compte-rendu des Travaux de la Commission Supérieure du Phylloxera' for 1885 contains reports from the Director of Agriculture; from six regional delegates, or men of equal authority; from the prefects of four departments; from twenty-six committees of study and of vigilance; from forty-four ministers, con-

suls, and vice-consuls abroad; and from thirty syndicates of defence against the phylloxera. As a result of so vigorous an exertion of both central and local initiation, the superficial area of defended or reconstituted vineyards, which in 1878 was 3 per cent. of that of the surface attacked by the pest, rose in 1884 to more than 17 per cent. The Director of Agriculture reports, in February 1885, that a million of hectares of vineyard had up to that time been destroyed by the terrible plant-louse, but that during the same period 600,000 hectares had been planted and disputed with the redoubtable enemy; so that only 429,000 hectares were at that date absolutely abandoned.

By a law dated July 22, 1874, the sum of 300,000 francs was allotted as a premium for the invention of an efficacious method of destroying the phylloxera. For the year 1885 the Superior Commission reports that the prize was still reserved, and that the modes of prevention recommended for the year were (1) submersion, (2) sulphide of carbon, (3) sulpho-carbonate of potassium. The remedies thus indicated are the survivals of a host of expedients that seem to have exhausted human ingenuity. The application of solid or pulverulent matters of insecticide virtue to the growing plants was naturally the first expedient tried. Manure, lime, iron pyrites, sulphur, tallow, ashes, sulphate of iron, sulphate of copper, have all been employed. From the activity of such agents the root-dwelling insect escapes by penetrating deeper into the soil, and establishing itself on the very lowest roots of the vine, where it is not easy to reach it. The employers of the various liquids that have been introduced in order to drench the soil have had to contend with the two difficulties, of either a solution too weak to destroy the larvæ, or one too strong to be applied with safety to the vine. To meet this practical difficulty is the object of the use of the sulphide of carbon, which was brought into notice during the long series of experiments made by the eminent French chemists who devoted their energies to the discovery of a remedy for the evil that threatened destruction to the French vineyards. Holes were bored in the earth at regular intervals—at first by an iron bar, and later on by a sort of auger specially constructed for the purpose—into each of which about two ounces of the bisulphide, or rather polysulphide, of carbon were poured as a liquid. The hole was stopped at the surface by the foot of the cultivator, and the chemical compound, rising in vapour, permeated the earth, and asphyxiated the insects at the roots of the vine. The ill results

which attended on the contact of the liquid with the root of the vine at first alarmed the cultivators. By degrees the true mode of application became better understood, and under a law passed in August 1879 the cultivators of the vine in certain regions have received, at the charge of the State, and applied themselves, under the inspection of the agents of the administration, this insecticide.

The use of the sulpho-carbonate of potassium was proposed by M. Dumas, and a few kilogrammes of the material were employed in 1874. In 1880 half a million of kilogrammes of this substance were applied by the Société Nationale to the treatment of 120 properties, at a cost of from 280 francs to 400 francs the hectare. The application is made in the proportion of from 60 to 125 grammes to each plant, and the efficiency of the treatment depends to a great extent on the value of the potash thus administered as food for the vegetation of the vine.

The interference of the State, which has allotted a sum of 1,250,000 francs in the recent annual budgets to subventions in aid of the struggle against the phylloxera, has been justified, on economical grounds, in a report by M. Joussan, published by the Institut in 1881. Allowing a mean production of eighty hectolitres of wine per hectare, that quantity contributes to the treasury the sum of 392 francs as taxation; to the communes 160 francs as *octroi*; to the railways 280 francs for transport; and to the wage fund of the country 80 francs for labour. This amounts to 912 francs per hectare; a sum entirely lost to the country, independent of any profit to the vine-growers, by the destruction of the vine. Thus a subvention of 400 francs per hectare, which was granted in the arrondissement of Béziers (for which the above figures are given), if paid by the State, and if effectual in the preservation of the crop, would still leave the country a gainer by more than 512 francs per hectare. We commend this lucid comparison to the pedantic advocates of *laissez faire*.

The substitution of American vines for the French stocks, by grafting or otherwise, from which much advantage was originally anticipated, is not recommended in the 'Compte-rendu de la Commission Supérieure du Phylloxera' in 1885. It is therefore needless now to pursue the subject further than to note that in France, as in America, the leaf of the American vines is the favourite abode of the parasite, while in the French vines it chiefly, if not exclusively, attacks the root, and that with a far more fatal result. By a law dated

in July 1882 the introduction of any foreign vine plants or cuttings into any uninfected districts is prohibited. By a decree of March 22, 1886, 182 arrondissements, situated in fifty-five departments, are declared to be 'phylloxérés'; and the prefects of all the departments are enjoined to address to the Minister of Agriculture, before October 1 of each year, a map showing the progress of the invasion of the phylloxera, and destined to serve for the preparation of the general phylloxeric map of France.

The determination of the biological cycle undergone by the phylloxera of the vine has led to the concentration of efforts to destroy the winter egg of the insect; a plan the success of which would greatly check, if not altogether prevent, the invasion of uninfected districts by the emigrant fly. Instructions as to the method of effecting this important object by the *badigeonnage*, or whitewashing of the vine stems, so as to form a preventive treatment, have been recently issued by the Minister of Agriculture, together with a table summarising the results of the application of that method in 1884-85 to forty localities situated in seventeen departments. The mixture recommended consists of 20 parts of *huile lourde de houille*, 60 parts of *naphtaline brute*, 120 parts of quicklime, and 400 parts of water. The cost of the process is estimated at 70 francs per hectare for the greater part of the vineyards of France, and 120 francs for those of Burgundy. For vines of more than five or six years old it is necessary to remove the bark before the application of the wash. M. P. de Lafitte has given a minute description of the method to be employed, which is reproduced in the ministerial circular.

There can be little doubt that one main cause of the rapidity with which the phylloxera has devastated the vineyards of France is that the earliest imported insects of the species were unaccompanied by the natural enemies which, in their native home, tended to maintain the balance of organic life. M. J. Lichtenstein, in the 'Observations sur le Phylloxera,' published by the Institut de France, for 1881, has cited seven species of parasites which prey upon aphides. These are, a species of thrips, the lady-bird, the wood-bug (*Anthocoris nemorum*), the plant-louse lion (*Hemerobius*), the red mite, a species of *Scymnus*, and a species of *Scyrrhus*. To each of these, however, he appends the discouraging note 'very little aid,' 'mediocre utility,' 'very limited utility,' and the like. He adds, however, 'Enfin, Riley cite trois ou quatre parasites de plus en

‘Amérique qui n’ont pas été encore signalés en Europe.’ It may be owing to this fact that the distinguished French naturalist has come to a conclusion which we think needs reconsideration.

‘Chief among the enemies and checks to such superabundant life,’ says Mr. Buckton (‘Monograph of British Aphides,’ vol. i. p. 170), ‘may be mentioned the numerous species of *Coccinella*, which forms one group of the large family of *Coleoptera*. It would appear that the beneficial influence to man exerted by these insects has been long and widely recognised. The singular names given to them throughout Europe seem to have reference to a supreme power, which through them staves off famine and preserves vegetation. Thus in Lombardy the popular synonym of our English lady-bird is *Bestiolina del Signore*. In Tuscany it is *Madonnina*, or *Mariolina*; in France it is *Bête de la Vierge*, or *Vâche à Dieu*. The food of *Coccinellæ* consists almost exclusively of aphides. Their marvellous voracity is shown equally in their larval and their winged condition. In some years the imagos are wonderfully numerous, and when they take wing form vast swarms, which travel great distances. By their sudden appearance in a district they often raise popular astonishment. In the year 1869 such a cloud passed over a large part of Kent, Sussex, and Surrey, alighting on the footways of Maidstone, Guildford, and Midhurst, and making it difficult to avoid crushing hundreds under foot.’

Mr. Buckton describes the mode in which the little beetle seizes and devours its prey, and says that it will consume from thirty to forty aphides in an hour. Again numerous minute species of the *Hymenoptera* (an order which Messrs. Kirby and Spence regarded as comprising perhaps one-fourth of the insect world), belonging to the genera *Cynipidæ*, *Ichneumonidæ*, and *Chalcididæ*, are aphidivorous. The *Psen atratus* constructs cells for the deposit of its eggs, in each of which it stores up aphides for the food of the young when hatched. Among the *Neuroptera*, the *Chrysopa*, or ‘golden eyes,’ insects of nocturnal habits, are especially destructive of aphides. ‘The promptitude and ‘fury shown in seizing its prey is best likened to the violent ‘shake given by a terrier dog or a weasel in its attack.’ The skin of the aphid, when emptied, is thrown by the aphidion on to its own back, where is thus formed a heap that entirely covers the predacious larva. The aid of such important allies may be successfully invoked by man. In his first Annual Report on the ‘Injurious and other Insects of ‘the State of New York,’ Mr. Lintner recommends ‘colonising lady-bugs on house plants and other vegetation infested with plant-lice.’

‘A few days since,’ Mr. Lintner writes, ‘a small peach tree in my

garden was so overrun with aphides as to threaten its destruction. I collected a number of the larvæ of *Adalia bipunctata* from other vegetation, where they could be spared, and transferred them to the peach tree. As the result, the tree is entirely free from aphid attack, and is putting out new leaves. The *Adalia* has pupated on the leaves, to emerge in a few days and to deposit its eggs for a new brood, ready to pursue its beneficial work wherever its service may be needed.'

The 'Compte-rendu des Travaux du Service du Phylloxera, 'année 1885,' published by the French Minister of Agriculture, contains seventy-nine pages of 'Renseignements sur le Phylloxera dans les Pays Etrangers.' Following the order adopted by the Director of Agriculture, we find it announced that the phylloxera made its appearance in September 1885 on the right bank of the Moselle, at the gates of Metz. The centre of infection is near that which was, in 1879, discovered and destroyed near Plantières. Thirteen points are indicated in which winged insects have been found; so that the danger of propagation in Germany is imminent. Energetic measures of protection were at once adopted. A report from the Consul General of France at Frankfort gives details of the proceedings at Plantières. The vines infected were all burned, and the soil was treated with carbon sulphide and sulpho-carbonate of potash. Replanting in the infected areas has been prohibited for ten years. Würtemberg is free from the phylloxera, some vines in the Royal domains, recently brought from America, which were attacked some time since, having been destroyed. In Westphalia the pest has spread on the right bank of the Rhine, owing to the supineness of the cultivators. Local committees have here been formed to deal with the attack, and a special course of study on the phylloxera has been instituted at the University of Bonn. At three places on the Rhine, and at two on its affluent the Ahr, the experts employed in disinfection applied during the autumn four hundred grammes of carbon-sulphide and four kilogrammes of petroleum, per square metre. In Saxony the phylloxera has not yet appeared, but the vines have suffered from the attacks of the *Anguillula radiciola*. In Hungary the presence of the phylloxera was first officially made known in 1875, but it is probable that it was introduced with some American plants in 1870. The Government ordered the eradication of the vines over fifty-nine hectares of vineyard. The soil was dug to a depth of seventy centimetres, and treated with 1,050 kilogrammes of sulphide of carbon per hectare, which, however, did not kill all the insects. The cost was very heavy, consisting in

977.50 francs per hectare indemnity to the proprietors; 1,785 francs cost of pulling up and burning the vines; 1,657 francs for sulphide of carbon and its application; and 156 francs for supervision and experiment: amounting in all to 74*l.* per acre. A law passed in 1876 prescribed, wherever the presence of the phylloxera was verified by the agricultural inspector, (1) the uprooting of the vines, (2) the prohibition of the culture of the vine for eight years, (3) indemnity to the proprietor. The law was ill-observed. In 1884 nearly 7,000 hectares, or 17 per cent. on the whole area of vineyards, had been destroyed, which was equal to a loss of 4,200,000 francs, reckoning the mean price of wine at thirty francs the hectolitre. The Government has actively bestirred itself, and the arrest of the plague, and the reconstitution of the destroyed vineyards are hoped for from the use of the sulphide of carbon. Nor is there any time to be lost, as the pest has extended along the foot of the Carpathian range, and is not far from the famous vineyards of Tokai.

Hungary contained in 1883, according to official statistics, 425,314 hectares of vineyard. In 1875 the vineyards of Pancsova were found to be attacked by the phylloxera; in 1878 five other centres of infection were discovered. The Government appointed six regional inspectors, and ordered an annual inspection of the whole vine-bearing area of the country. A Superior Commission of the Phylloxera was appointed, and the transport of vines through the country was forbidden. The culture of American vines on a large scale was undertaken, and sulphide of carbon, with the apparatus for its use, was furnished gratuitously by the Government to the vine cultivator. The invasion has not yet touched quite two per cent. of the vine-growing area of Hungary. In Dalmatia, where there is an area of 67,699 hectares of vineyard, which yielded, in 1882, 1,420,250 hectolitres of wine, the insect has not yet appeared. In Istria a struggle is maintained against the invader, all other remedies having been superseded by the sulphide of carbon. Bulgaria is as yet intact. The phylloxera has not appeared in the vine-growing district of Varna, and severe measures have been adopted by the Government to prevent its importation.

From Spain there are detailed accounts. In Valentia the phylloxera has not made its appearance, although the mildew is on the increase. The decrease of the French grape crop has led to a rise in the price of Spanish wines; those which formerly sold for from eight to ten francs per hectolitre now commanding the price of from fifteen to twenty-five francs,

and even, as a temporary thing, from thirty to thirty-two francs. The exports of wine from this province, chiefly to France, have risen to 1,500,000 hectolitres, representing about twenty-seven millions of francs. In the district of Rosas, on the contrary, the loss, which in 1884 amounted to two-thirds of the vintage, is as much, for 1885, as four-fifths of the former yield. The application of insecticide has been a failure, and the introduction of American vines appears to afford the only hope entertained by the vine-growers of Rosas. In the province of Malaga, only one-fourth of the vine-growing area remains untouched, the mischief being entirely due to the phylloxera. On the other hand, this insect has not yet penetrated the province of Jaen, where the *Pyrals* and the locusts are yearly extending their ravages. Cordova has also escaped; but the pest has appeared in the district of Adra, in the government of Almeria, where nothing has been done to check its increase. In the Peloponnesus the vine is the principal culture. The introduction of foreign plants was here prohibited, and the phylloxera has not appeared in Greece, or in the Ionian Islands.

As to Italy, according to a report presented to the Chamber of Deputies on May 30, 1885, by M. Grimaldi, Minister of the Interior, of Agriculture, and of Commerce, the phylloxera has not made its appearance, either in Tuscany, in Romagna, or in the continental Neapolitan provinces. But in the north the three provinces of Como, Port Maurice, and Milan are attacked. In the first of these, in 1879, nineteen centres were infected; in 1884 the number was fifty-two. At Port Maurice, in 1879, there were two; in 1884, sixty-one. In the Milanese, in 1879, there were eight centres of attack; in 1884, only one. In Sicily the foci of infection continue to multiply and to extend. In the provinces of Cattanissetta, of Catania, and of Sassari a much larger number were discovered in 1884 than in the preceding years. At last the insect has appeared in Syracuse. 'Ugly surprise of the year!' says the report of M. Grimaldi.

Two methods have been adopted to combat the plague—one destructive, the other curative. The first, which consists in destroying the vines for a certain distance round an infected centre, has been applied energetically in the north, and with satisfactory results. In Italy the malady is too widely spread to be thus nipped in the bud. The State has allotted a subvention of one hundred francs per hectare in favour of the application of the remedies recommended by the Government; but no one has applied for the grant.

In the year 1884 the State and the provinces together have expended about 1,200,000 francs in measures to combat the phylloxera, viz. 421,691 francs for indemnities where vines have been destroyed ; 49,666 francs for purchase of sulphide of carbon ; and 19,620 francs for the gratuitous distribution of American vines. The total product of wine in Italy amounts to 27,500,000 hectolitres per year. The price at the market at Florence ranges from a minimum of 57.04 francs per hectolitre for the red wine of the year, third quality, to 109.69 for *vin rouge commun, vieux*.

The invasion of Portugal by the phylloxera, according to the French Minister at Lisbon, advances rapidly. The vineyards of Estremadura are nearly all attacked. In one canton the sulphide of carbon has been applied, but most of the proprietors are indifferent, inactive, and without confidence in the treatment, holding that it kills the vines, and renders the ground sterile. The untouched vines are magnificent, but the inspector of the phylloxeric service reports that unless energetic measures are taken the vineyards of Portugal will be ruined.

Preventive measures are adopted in Russia. In Switzerland the spread of the malady has been checked by the activity of the Government. The cost of inspection and the indemnities paid to proprietors for the destruction of their vines amount to a total of 260,000 francs during a term of ten years. At this small cost, involving the destruction of seven hectares of vineyard, the Swiss Confederation has saved the greater part of a produce which is of an annual value of 2,939,123 francs. From Smyrna, from Alexandretta, and from Lattakia the reports state that the phylloxera has not appeared, but it has been seen on the Asiatic littoral of the Sea of Marmora, and in the vineyards of Maslak, on the European side of the Bosphorus.

In Victoria the phylloxera was first found in 1875, in the district of Geelong, about forty miles south-west of Melbourne. Acts of the Colonial Parliament were passed in 1877, 1880, and 1881 with a view of limiting the ravages of the insect. Infected vines, and all vines within two and a half miles of a centre of infection, were burnt. The land was turned over and left in fallow, and was not to be replanted for four years. The proprietors were allowed, by way of indemnity, the value of one year's produce of the infected, and of three years' produce of the non-infected, vines thus destroyed. The vine-growing Australian colonies—Victoria, New South Wales, and Southern Australia—contri-

buted to the expenses, and, at the date of the last consular report, owing to these energetic measures, the phylloxera has not passed the limits of Geelong, and has exercised no appreciable influence on the production of wine in the colony of Victoria.

Throughout the civilised world, while the cultivators of the vine have been slow to avail themselves of the aid of science to combat this terrible economic scourge, the Governments, the men of science, and the most influential of the rural authorities and proprietors have vied with each other in the energy and assiduity with which they have set themselves to study and combat the invader. We have found no single instance of either an anti-insecticide propaganda, based on the ground of the wickedness of any attempt to frustrate the will of Providence, and to extirpate a whole family of insects; or of a systematic opposition to the measures directed to prevent the introduction of the phylloxera, by the prohibition of the import of vine plants, except under very special arrangements, on the ground of such measures being violations of the great principle of Free Trade. Had the case been our own, it is possible that opposition would have been made on grounds like these to any such bold attempt to grapple with the danger as has been made by the Governments of France, of Italy, and elsewhere. Our recent action in the face of terrible but preventible disease contrasts very vividly with the spirit in which France has grappled with the phylloxera. But it is a mistake to suppose that the British administration does not watch with care and circumspection the occurrence of any similar dangers, and the Order in Council of August 17, 1877, as to the Colorado beetle, appears to have been perfectly successful in preventing the invasion of this destroyer of the potato.

The entire history of the spread of this terrible plague, which, almost under our very eyes, has annihilated one of the most lucrative agricultural industries over a large area of the richest soil of France, affords a most instructive lesson as to the need, in national defence, of somewhat the same organisation as that which is required for the army and navy services of a country, against the almost invisible approach of insect invaders, bearing plague and famine on their gauze-like wings. It cannot be positively asserted that without steam navigation the American plant-louse, which has devoured so many of the richest vineyards of France, would never have been brought to Europe. But it is at least certain that, from the time of Columbus down to some

sixteen or eighteen years ago, such an importation never did occur. It is also certain that from the moment that this microscopic bug—less than $\frac{1}{120}$ th of an inch in length, and possibly arriving in a single egg—struck its long beak into the leaf of the French vine, the insect was, foot to foot, so to speak, too strong for the vine-grower. All that science can do, by the most complete intercommunion and mutual aid of its leaders—all that Government can do, not only in the way of collecting and of distributing trustworthy information, but in that of active, positive, coercive interference—has been as necessary in defence against this insect ravager as it would have been against a sudden invasion of Mongols. Individual resistance is simply nowhere. When prompt and what may be called brutal measures have been adopted, the vines plucked up and burnt, healthy and untouched as many of them were, within a certain radius of the first gall spot; when the frontier has been carefully guarded against the importation of any possibly infected plants; when no one has been allowed to have his own way with his own vineyard—because one ignorant or pig-headed proprietor might have ensured the destruction of thousands of acres belonging to his neighbours—in a word, when all the resources of the State have been resolutely combined in face of a great danger, that danger has been arrested or beaten back. So it has been in Victoria; so it has been in the Milanese; so it has been, to a great extent, in France; and so would it have been, no doubt, altogether in that country if the sound knowledge of the nature of the danger which French science and observation acquired during the fury of its spread had been possessed in the first instance.

We have been careful, in speaking of the propagation of this terrible plant pestilence, to limit our statement within the bounds of ascertained facts; for when naturalists have passed from the province of facts to that of figures they have gone absolutely wild.

‘Réaumur calculates that one aphid may be the mother of the enormous number of 5,904,900,000 individuals during the month or six weeks of her existence. Probably the daily birth (of about twenty-five in one day), as given by Latreille, is above the truth; yet I,’ says Mr. Buckton (vol. i. p. 79), ‘have witnessed the birth of eight young from the same mother in six hours, viz. from ten o’clock in the morning to four o’clock in the afternoon. However this may be, neither Tougaard nor Morren is satisfied with Latreille’s billions, but both state that quintillions are within the capabilities of a single mother’s efforts. Professor Huxley makes a curious calculation, though for a different purpose, which at any rate affords some approxi-

mate idea of what a quintillion of aphides might mean. Assuming that an aphis weighs as little as one-thousandth of a grain, and that it requires a man to be very stout to weigh more than two million grains, he shows that the tenth brood of aphides alone, without adding the products of all the generations which precede the tenth, if all the numbers survive the perils to which they are exposed, contains more ponderable substance than 500 millions of stout men—that is, more than the whole population of China.’

But a mathematical friend of Mr. Buckton thinks this inadequate.

‘Supposing the progeny of the first aphis to equal twenty in twenty days, and the progeny to begin producing, when five days old, twenty young, each of which again, on attaining the age of five days, begins the propagation of twenty young, and completes that number in twenty days, the amount at the end of 300 days would not be less than the fifteenth power of 210, which it is almost impossible to express in figures. There would be room in the world for nothing else but aphides.’

Calculations of this nature partake rather of the character of the cram of the competitive examiner than of that calm science which keeps within the limits of the conceivable. As the food necessary for the sustentation of aphis life would be exhausted at an early stage of this tremendous progression, to advance with the multiplication is only scientific trifling. It is more to the point to say that the insect hosts, which in certain regions of the earth prohibit the abode of man, are able, with but small vantage of start, to master him at times in temperate climates and in the strongholds of civilisation. What they can do in their own territories has just been described in the words which we translate from one of the latest contributions to our knowledge of the isthmus of Panama, written by a gentleman who spent two years in that hopeless struggle with the forces of tropical nature which has been pleasantly called making a survey of the country—a country in which every sleeper on the railway that runs across it is said to have been laid on a grave. This is the insect activity of Panama:—

‘It seemed as if at nightfall a world was born. One then felt life to spring and palpitate with an alarming intensity. It was above all things an invasion of insects. At each step the foot crushed hundreds; at each movement of the hand a handful was grasped; at each movement the face was grazed by the swarms that circled in the air. They were breathed, they were swallowed. The flame of a lamp was extinguished in a few minutes under heaps of their little bodies, with russet coverlets, glancing with metallic reflections, or with great wings diapered and wadded like those of moths; and all those beatings of

wings, those rustlings of elytra, join in a monstrous hum, which fills the forest and mounts to the sky; while in the clear tropical night great trees, like centres of illumination, shone under millions of fire-flies.'

In contemplating the insect world the most accomplished naturalist is soon taught how narrow is the limit of human knowledge, and how delicate is the balance of the productive powers of nature. The self-satisfied empiric who is confident that he has explained away the old-fashioned ideas of creative power and wisdom by his theories of self-guided evolution is struck dumb by the relics of a butterfly treasured up for the long ages that have elapsed since the deposit of the Carboniferous strata. The theory of natural selection proves a ridiculous failure when its advocate is asked to explain the transformations of the winged insect. The most accepted physiological laws as to animal reproduction are laughed to scorn by that fission of the individual which is carried to so remarkable an extent in the voracious and prolific race of the aphides. We are indeed forcibly reminded of the modesty which so well became the brilliant genius of Newton when we see broad provinces struck with poverty by the gauzy wing of an almost microscopic fly; and an economic loss, amounting to more than a hundred and twenty millions sterling, occasioned by the importation of a few eggs—perhaps of a single egg—of the American phylloxera.

ART. III.—*The Architectural History of the University of Cambridge, and of the Colleges of Cambridge and Eton.* By the late ROBERT WILLIS, M.A., F.R.S., Jacksonian Professor and sometime Fellow of Caius College; with additions by JOHN WILLIS CLARK, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In four volumes. 4to. Cambridge University Press: 1886.

MR. CLARK, the editor and chief compiler of a work that thus claims a double authorship, acknowledges in fitting terms (Preface, p. xxxii) the 'splendid liberality' of the Syndics of the 'University Press' in publishing, after some considerable delay, these magnificent volumes, and also the pains and anxiety of the working staff to produce them 'in the best possible manner.' Extensive, and necessarily costly, as the result of such varied research has proved to be, the admirable plan and arrangement, not to say the very

full index of 100 pages, really leave nothing to be desired. There is not a chapter in the work that can be called dull; information of the most novel kind is everywhere to be found, and that conveyed in the most interesting way, and in a style commendable for its unaffected simplicity of expression. It is a big book, but not made bigger than it need have been by either fine writing or superfluous 'padding.'

The first two volumes give the topographical and architectural history of the seventeen colleges of the University, together with a minutely detailed description of Eton College, modern and ancient. The third volume contains a similar history of the University buildings, such as the Schools, the Senate House, the Library, Printing Press, Museums, &c. It also includes separate essays, all of which are of special interest and importance, on the 'Component Parts of the College.' Thus we have the Hall, the Combination-room (or parlour), the Lodge, the Library, the Chapel, the Students' Chambers, separately treated, and the same features as they exist at Oxford brought into comparison, dates, where known, being invariably added. Throughout the work beautiful and well-drawn illustrations are profusely interspersed. The fourth volume is entirely devoted to maps and plans. These show most laborious research, and are beautifully executed in distinctive colours, generally with an overlying duplicate, printed on transparent cloth, to show the modern in close contact with the ancient plan. The third volume concludes with a glossary of mediæval terms, an addition rendered desirable by the frequent citation of conveyances, contracts, college orders and accounts, of early date.

It is not, however, only the history of the foundation and building of the colleges, but the relation of the collegiate to the monastic system, that has been made the subject of enquiry. 'The general plan and disposition of a college,' it is observed, 'has so remarkable an analogy with that of a monastery, that we might naturally assume that the former had been copied from the latter upon the first invention of a college.' The conclusion arrived at is that 'it is impossible to maintain any theory of direct derivation of a college from a monastery,' and that at Cambridge at least, where the influence of Wykeham had been scarcely felt, the baronial hall rather than any conventual buildings suggested the arrangement of the parts of a college.

Of course there are many points connected with the rise

and progress of the Universities, as the centres of the higher education in this country, which are even more interesting and important than the history of the buildings, and of these points the authors have not been unmindful. On one other point—the continued popularity and usefulness of these ancient institutions at the present day, while the older and formerly richer and more influential religious houses have passed away, and left only ruins for their records—as the authors are entirely silent, we offer a few brief remarks, at the risk of their being regarded as needlessly apologetic.

It is sometimes charged against the Universities, (1) that they encourage, or do not discourage, idleness; (2) that they are too luxurious; (3) that the standard of learning has never been really high, nor the number of really learned men in them great; (4) that the endowment of many hundreds of sinecure fellowships, besides a large staff of well-paid professors and other officers is out of joint, so to say, with the spirit of the age.

Now it is, perhaps, true that the greater number even of those who have taken high degrees, and been rewarded by fellowships, prove, in after life, rather well-informed than ‘learned,’ in the German sense of the word. But it is also true that the advantages of a University education are at least as much ethical and social as purely intellectual. There is a general standard of honour and truthfulness, a fairness of dealing, and a willingness to give credit to sincerity under all diversities of thought, with other social virtues which are imbibed at the Universities and carried into society at large. In a nation so divided in sentiment and so largely devoted to trade and commerce, these virtues are of more real value to the community at large than a higher standard of learning. The action then of the Universities on the nation appears to be this: They provide prizes in a lottery so numerous, so honourable, and so rich, that a large number of youths of all classes are tempted to compete for them, and thus even the mass of those who go unrewarded gain the advantage of a few years’ residence in a centre where narrow-mindedness is almost impossible. Again, in an age of great wealth and great luxury, the Universities, if they are to attract the sons of the rich, cannot follow a hard and fast line of mediæval simplicity. They must move with the age; they cannot go backwards. Time was, we are told (iii. p. 351), when ‘in the wealthiest lodge in the University (King’s, in 1451) ‘there was only one chair, and the tables were supported on ‘trestles, and those who used them sat on forms and stools.’

The splendid hospitality of the colleges, so often called their 'luxury,' confers a real social benefit in bringing all classes of minds, both young and old, into constant and amicable and courteous intercourse. No places in the world are more kindly in their sympathy or more truly considerate of feelings than the cultured society of the college hall and the combination-room. We might add with truth that there is no place where cultured men so readily and so freely interchange ideas as at the dinner table.

These considerations form the best answer that can be given to the objections raised on the score of exaggerated and nationally useless wealth. It is a safer and better answer than the questionable position that 'private' property * and vested interests are inviolable rights. Indeed, on no other plea can we defend the practice, now gradually becoming obsolete, of allowing non-residents, perhaps making large professional incomes, to retain life-fellowships.

We must commence our remarks by explaining the share which Professor Willis had not only in the work before us, but in raising architectural research into the dignity of a science. His lamented death took place in 1875. For all that he did, and it was much, though of a different kind, he deserves to be enshrined among the eminent designers and builders of the Cambridge colleges, of whom a brief but interesting biography is given in the tenth chapter of this publication, such as Ralph Symons, Thomas and Robert Gumbold, Christopher Wren, Nicolas Hawkesmoore, James Gibbs, James Burrough, James Essex, all eminent for skill in classic design, whatever the one-idea 'Gothicists' may now think of the works they have left. And here let us briefly say, in high praise of both Mr. Clark and Professor Willis, that they show an equal appreciation of the beautiful in the Tudor, the Italian, the Jacobean or Renaissance; they saw clearly that Cambridge is rich in varied and graceful designs, which are too often turned away from contemptuously as 'debased.' On the curious oscillations of cultured academic taste between classic and mediæval designs, we shall have more to say as we proceed.

On Mr. John Willis Clark, late Fellow of Trinity College,

* 'I am of opinion that the arbitrary resumption by the State of the property of the colleges would be just as unconstitutional as would be the resumption by the State of the properties of the Duke of Bedford and the Duke of Cleveland' (Dr. Phelps, Master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, writing in 1873).

and nephew of the late Professor Willis, the task of editing his unfinished papers had devolved since the death of the author. The 'history' was left indeed in shape, but not nearly completed in its details. 'At no college was the work quite finished; if the history of the buildings was complete, that of the site would be unfinished, or *vice versâ*' (Pref. p. xxii). Consequently, Mr. Clark had to take up and work out the whole subject anew; making use everywhere of the college records and early maps and plans that have survived from the end of the sixteenth century. 'I came to the conclusion,' he says, 'that in order to produce the work in a way which should be worthy alike of the author and of the University, it would be necessary to go back to the point from which he had himself started, and investigate the whole subject afresh.'

Eleven years spent in so wide and difficult an enquiry, long as the time may seem, indicate energy rather than remissness. In such hands no failure was possible. Numerous and excellent as are the illustrated and antiquarian works on Cambridge and its University, from Baker's 'History' to Cooper's 'Annals,' including the now rare and curious maps of Richard Lyne in 1574, and of John Hamond in 1592, and Loggan's 'bird's-eye' views of the colleges from drawings made about 1688, this large and splendid work far surpasses, as it makes frequent and ample use of, them all.

Professor Willis, to whom the design of the work and so large a part of the execution of it are due, was singularly qualified for the architectural department of the enquiry, and in the deciphering of fabric-rolls and mediæval documents bearing on construction he had acquired considerable experience by his studies of the cathedrals. He possessed a special faculty and tact for observation, skill as a draughtsman, and the gift of drawing safe conclusions from small evidences; while in practical knowledge of detail, especially of mouldings (or 'moldings' as he preferred to spell it) he was absolutely without a rival. Those who had the privilege of accompanying him in his explorations, either in the University or in his visits to the several cathedrals on which he delivered lectures, will bear testimony to the originality of his method, as an interpreter of Gothic art. The analysis of a Gothic building and its various alterations and additions became, in his hands, a new science. He may be said to have found the key, and first to have unlocked the treasure-store.

Five-and-forty years ago, when Oxford was being agitated by rival theological parties, a similar movement, though in a different form, was initiated at Cambridge. In this University the 'new departure' appeared under a triple aspect, æsthetic, antiquarian, and religious. Like most movements in which enthusiasm is the mainspring of action, that of church restoration at Cambridge had a rapid spread, and a remarkable career of success. Philosophically considered, phases of thought, like changes in tastes, fashions, and social habits, are but operations of the great and universal law of evolution. The history of all is precisely the same; they rise suddenly, extend widely and rapidly, and surely but gradually disappear. We shall have to remark, that under the prevailing taste of the last century, the University narrowly escaped becoming a group of Italian buildings, just as now the mild and not ungraceful Italianism called 'Queen Anne's style,' is again coming into vogue. But at the time we speak of, about half a century ago, a 'Gothic' mania broke out with fury. Welby Pugin, by his writings and clever reproductions of the mediæval decorations of the finest period, was just then giving a new impulse to 'Catholic art.' He poured satire and contempt on everything Italian, which he called 'Revived Pagan.' The study of Gothic architecture and the exploration of the ancient parish churches in the more remote villages, suddenly became an epidemic. Full of objects of antiquarian interest as they often were, though so long and so strangely overlooked or neglected, these fabrics were then for the most part in a discreditable state of dilapidation and decay. Where repairs, or rather patchings and botchings, had been made in the style known as 'Churchwardens' Gothic,' they were disfigurements rather than improvements, and if much had to be done, not a little had to be undone by more judicious restorers.

All this naturally led to a deeper study of the principles of Gothic design. In this, as we shall show, Professor Willis led the way. Where practical architects had brought æsthetic taste and, to some extent, historical inquiry to bear on the subject, he brought the knowledge of mechanical and constructive principles, tending to show why a mere copy of Gothic features so often results in a failure. 'Cockney Gothic,' 'Carpenters' Gothic,' 'Builders' Gothic,' 'Churchwardens' Gothic,' are terms familiarly applied to pretentious designs rich in crockets and pinnacles, but provoking ridicule rather than admiration, from their false proportions and misapplied

decorations. Yet the old village church, with its rough walls and rude tower, somehow or other is Gothic all over, true of its kind, yet wholly unpretentious.

The desire to restore *correctly* naturally followed this newly-acquired knowledge. Enthusiasm on all sides was kindled, and when the national movement towards church-restoration had fairly set in, very large sums were readily collected and quickly spent. Of course, the college chapels, which had been largely Italianised during the last century, received their full share of costly renovation and decoration. Wealthy Churchmen vied with each other in the munificence of their gifts, and cathedrals and minsters, as well as remote village churches, felt the benefit of the Gothic revival. And now, at the end of less than half a century from the commencement of the movement, comparatively little remains to be done. Were Professor Willis still among us, he could exclaim with just pride, *Exegi monumentum*. For there can be no question that he was, though most unostentatiously, a leader in the movement which has achieved such surprising results.

Among the many distinguished members of the local architectural society then formed, under the title of 'The Cambridge Camden Society,' including heads of colleges, bishops and peers, and clergy of all degrees, Professor Willis was one. Keeping entirely aloof from the somewhat 'advanced' theological views of the younger enthusiasts, he devoted himself strictly to a research into the practice of mediæval architecture. In co-operation with a fellow-labourer, a member of the same university, whose name deserves to be recorded with all honour, Edmund Sharpe, M.A., then practising as an architect at Lancaster, he investigated the rise and development of window tracery from the single lancet light, of vaulting in connexion with the use of the pointed arch, of Gothic 'moldings,' of the triforium and clerestory of the larger fabrics, and the plans and arrangements of monastic edifices. Mr. Sharpe's magnificent folio work 'Architectural Parallels,' containing lithographic drawings, both in perspective and reduced to a scale, of the principal English abbeys, a well-conceived and well-executed manual (1851), 'The Seven Periods of English Architecture,' 'The Rise and Progress of Decorated Window-Tracery in England' (1849), with other works on 'Moldings,' on the ground-plan of Cistercian abbeys—all these assisted the movement by extending the knowledge of true principles. It was now felt how little had hitherto

been understood about Gothic composition. Another contemporary of eminence, Dr. Whewell, then Master of Trinity College, by his work on the French and German cathedrals, traced the rise of Gothic from Romanesque, and showed that the use, not the invention, of the pointed arch, which was forced on the builders by the requirements of vaulting, was the real cause of the transition from Norman to Gothic. Not to be forgotten is the name of Dr. Peacock, who, while Dean of Ely, undertook and nobly carried out the vast work of restoring his cathedral, which had fallen into a sad state of shabbiness and disrepair.

‘The plan,’ says Mr. Clark, ‘which Professor Willis followed in his architectural histories of cathedrals was to bring together all the recorded evidence that belongs to the building, excluding historical matter that relates only to the see or district; to examine the building itself for the purpose of investigating the mode of its construction, and the successive changes and additions that have been made to it; and, lastly, to compare the recorded evidence with the structural evidence as much as possible.’ (Introd. p. xcii.)

Precisely the same methods of enquiry have been pursued in the history of the colleges. Here, fortunately, documents abound, and the college accounts, which have been kept with care and minuteness from quite early—i.e. ante-Reformation—times, generally give positive evidence of the changes made. But the careful comparison of existing details, in which Professor Willis had great skill and experience, of itself led him to the right conclusions. He was the first to establish the fact, as remarkable as it is important, that the profiles of moldings in arches, string-courses, capitals, and bases, afford as sure an indication of style and date in Gothic buildings as fossils do of geological eras. By the invention of a clever little instrument which he named the ‘Cymagraph,’ he was able to take, in reduced scales, exact profiles of any moldings, vertical or horizontal. It was thus he was enabled to pronounce with certainty on the true dates of the doorways of Peterhouse Hall, the Early English portions of the now destroyed chapel of St. John’s, and the different parts of Jesus College chapel.

The architects who, in the first half of the present century, reverted to Tudor Gothic in designing new courts for the colleges, Wilkins and Rickman, had no deep appreciation of the principles of Gothic composition, that is to say, they copied details without realising what we may call the Gothic *feeling*. This is shown by the fact that their leading idea was symmetry and correspondence of parts. There is con-

sequently a tameness and a monotony in their works which, as it strikes us, falls flat in comparison with the plain and irregular old collegiate designs in red brick, as seen at St. John's, Jesus, Queen's, Magdalene, and with the many interesting works now destroyed, but shown in Loggan's plans. We may wonder, as well as regret, that the original plan for building the new court of St. John's in red brick, and after the style of the Second Court, was given up for the much more costly material of squared blocks of Ketton stone (vol. ii. p. 278). The authorities had not realised the fact that collegiate buildings, especially the gateways, admit of a certain roughness in the masonry with the best effect. Yet an excellent example of this might have been noticed in the gateway entrance to the cathedral precincts at Ely, within a few miles of the university. Old brick-work, for instance, has usually much wider joints; and where rag, or rubble, or hammer-dressed stones of small size are the material used, with quoins for the angles and window-jambs, an excellent result is produced at the smallest cost. The mediæval architects understood this far better than we do. With modern architects, economy is not likely to be the ruling motive. Many of our finest abbeys, most of our castles, very many church towers, especially of earlier work, were built in this rough way with stones of all sizes and shapes, just as they came from the quarry, untouched by hammer or chisel. But large sums were spent by the colleges during the last century in 'ashlaring' the old walls and replacing the old Tudor windows by square casements. James Essex, a man not without cleverness, is often mentioned in these volumes for casing old brick or rubble walls, as the south side of the first court of St. John's, with cut stone, and dressing down the finely-jointed new work till it resembled the section of a cheese. When we see the excellent effect of red brick in the new ladies' college at Girton, and compare the prodigious cost of the courts built with squared Ketton stone, at King's, Corpus, Downing, St. John's, and Trinity, we may justly regret that some knowledge on these practical matters did not form part of an academic education. The new court at Trinity, we learn (vol. ii. p. 659), which cost a little over 50,000*l.*, was designed to be either brick or stone, an alternative 'unfortunately abandoned in favour of stucco.' The new buildings at Corpus cost about the same, 'if not considerably more.' The new court and hall at King's cost rather more than 100,000*l.*, the new court at St. John's (Rickman's), nearly 80,000*l.* The

really surprising thing is, that any one who had Queen's and St. John's red brick courts and gateways within sight, even if he did not know Wolsey's buildings at Hampton Court, nor the beautiful brickwork of so many country houses, dating from Henry VIII. to Charles II., should have persisted in preferring Ketton stone. At least 50,000*l.*, it seems, were spent on Wilkins's poor design for Downing College, all the front walls being faced with cut stone at the greatest cost and with the poorest effect. If it seems invidious to criticise that which is now past recall, mistakes in future may be avoided by returning to the old partiality for brick, if it should become more generally felt that squared stone has no superiority in cost, durability, or picturesque effect. We are not speaking of palaces, nor of the mansions of the nobility, nor of public buildings, but solely of collegiate designs, which ought to follow the old and truly collegiate principles of composition. If we are not mistaken, the authors of the work before us entirely concur in these views.

As at Oxford, Bath stone, not always good of its kind, so at Cambridge 'clunch' (a stratum lowest in the chalk) was too much used for external work. Both of them are more or less perishable from the effects of weather, especially of frost. At Christ's College

'the external walls were originally built of blocks of clunch in courses, alternating with red brick, and, consequently, from the perishable nature of that material, had become so sordid and decayed as to make repair imperative. Indeed, it is said to have presented so ruinous and repulsive an appearance that persons were deterred from entering students therein. From this time the ashlarling of the college began, and was carried on in successive stages through the greater part of the last century, until it was brought to its present aspect' (vol. ii. p. 222).

The first work of repair (begun in 1714) was the casing of the Gate House with free-stone; the next, the west front, and then the interior of the court was taken in hand in accordance with a College Order in 1758: 'Agreed that the 'south side of the first court be new cased with stone according to the plan' (Italian) 'and under the direction of 'Mr. Essex.'

This was James Essex, who was much employed at Cambridge at this period. 'He was the fashionable architect of the time.' His work of the same kind at the sister college of St. John is thus described: 'In 1772 St. John's 'College was seized with the prevailing mania for Itali-

‘cising the surface of their buildings, which happily exhausted their means when they had completed the south side of the first quadrangle’ (p. 318). The College Order is here also quoted: ‘Agreed that the side of the first court opposite to the chapel be covered with stone, sashed, and otherwise improved agreeably to a plan given in by Mr. Essex.’ Cole’s just but unfavourable criticisms on this work, written the very next year, are given in the same page. He calls it ‘the idle scheme they are now about.’ Evidently, our authors take the same view, that of regret at the Italian beautification of old red brick walls. Thus they speak of ‘the unlimited use of cement to make the rough and picturesque walls’ (of the great court at Trinity) ‘smooth and neat.’

Similarly ‘Trinity Hall had been Italianised by means of an ashlar casing, five or six years before 1749, under direction of Mr. Burrough’ (afterwards Master of Caius), and Gonville court was now condemned to a similar ‘disguise.’ The interesting Elizabethan structures at Caius College, left complete by Dr. Caius, were indeed cruelly treated.

‘The unique and picturesque composition of Caius Court, and the care and pains which the founder bestowed upon every part of the detail as evidenced by his annals, added to his expressed wishes as shown by his 28th Statute: “That no one, under pain of expulsion, should make any alteration or mutilation in the form of the fabric of his college as he had in his lifetime made and left it,” ought to have protected his architectural works from wanton change. But, unfortunately, when the interior of the chapel was refitted in 1717, and its exterior reashlared, the buttresses were transformed into the heavy rococo form they now exhibit, the fashion of the windows changed, and the Sacred Tower demolished. Thus the north side of the court, which the founder had taken so much pains to bring into conformity with his own buildings, was reduced to its present extremely ugly and incongruous state’ (vol. i. p. 184).

The Georgian era, during the reign of classic taste, fell heavily on the picturesque but often small and inconvenient college buildings. What was to be done? The area was small, and more and better accommodation was a necessity. Some wanted one thing, some quite another. It was thus that the fine old court of King’s was ‘unfortunately sacrificed to a controversy between the partisans of rival styles’ (vol. iii. p. 264). The Italian, which had become the fashion, offered many advantages in rebuilding; the mistake made was in the absurd attempts to Italianise

Gothic. It seems more difficult to understand the true spirit of Gothic than of Italian design, and the attempts at Gothic in the last century would have been sad failures. Moreover, Italian appears to be cheaper than Gothic. Wren's magnificent Library at Trinity, completed in 1695, cost only about 16,500*l.*; the equally fine Italian structure known as 'Gibbs's Building,' forming the west side of King's College, cost under 13,000*l.*; while the completion of the south side of the court, including the New Lodge, a Gothic design by Wilkins, amounted to 'rather more than '100,000*l.*' The gateway in the centre of the screen is a somewhat fantastic and unmeaning composition. The artist (William Wilkins) 'was possessed with a spirit of symmetrical arrangement,' says Professor Willis. Half the charm of mediæval buildings is their 'asymmetry,' as every one now knows.

That Wilkins, when he built the present Gothic range opposite to King's chapel, should actually have proposed to 'Gothicise Gibbs's Building' is justly characterised by Professor Willis as 'the most extraordinary part of the scheme.' Conversely the old Tudor hall at Queens' actually was Italianised by Sir James Burrough in 1732-34, and so were the chapels of Christ's and Jesus Colleges; and there are many instances recorded in these volumes of the oscillations of taste between the classic and the mediæval styles.

Much as we may wonder at the æsthetic taste that could place a Palladian design, Gibbs's Building, in such close approximation to King's College chapel, it is not to be denied that it is really a fine building of its kind. It was indeed but a portion of an Italian design, by Nicolas Hawkesmoore, a pupil of Wren, for a complete Italian court. We may go so far as to doubt whether, considering that the most beautiful and uniform collegiate structure in the University of Cambridge, Clare Hall, also Palladian or Italian throughout, already stood as close to the great Tudor Chapel on the north as Gibbs's Building stands on the south—whether it would not have been wiser to carry out Hawkesmoore's Italian design for a new court than to complete it in a style uniform with the chapel, but incongruous with the Italian portion already erected.

It had been proposed in 1748 to adopt a classical design, with a cloister on the east side (i.e. that farthest from Trumpington Street), for enlarging the College of Corpus Christi. This would have harmonised well with the plain

brick buildings of St. Catherine's just opposite, and still better if the design for that college given by Loggan in 1688, showing an Italian frontage to Trumpington Street, had been completed. And had an Italian design been selected for the new buildings of University Press, instead of Mr. Blore's 'symmetrical' Gothic, with its rather unmeaning church-tower in the centre, and had the proposed addition of a wing completing the rectangle now formed by the Public Library and the Senate House been carried out according to Gibbs's plan, then the whole line of University Buildings from Great St. Mary's Church to the Fitzwilliam Museum would now have been, with slight exceptions at Pembroke and Peterhouse, uniformly classical. In the centre of this group King's College Chapel would have reared its stately turrets and stood alone in its glory. We like to contemplate what might have been, if Wilkins and the Gothicising reaction had not stood in the way. For we confess to a great admiration for the Senate House and the Public Library front facing St. Mary's. The former is justly called (vol. iii. p. 536) 'an extremely elegant and beautiful piece of architecture.' It appears to have been the work of Gibbs, commenced in 1722. Even Caius, till the recent addition by Alfred Waterhouse, in the ornate style of a French château—the height of which, unfortunately, greatly injures the relative proportions of the Senate-House, as the great tower at St. John's 'kills' those of the adjoining hall—even the quaint Elizabethan style of this college would have had no quarrel with its classic neighbours, and the soul of good Dr. Caius would have rested in peace.

Beside the description and history of the Colleges, this work supplies a great deal of information on the origin of Universities. The university of the middle ages was a corporation of learned men, associated for the purposes of 'teaching,' and entitled to grant diplomas, on examination of the due qualifications for teaching. The word itself, *universitas*, must have meant 'the turning towards one object' (*unum versus*), and thus it was used to express a 'union of independent members all working in one direction,' just as 'the universe' is the whole cosmic system, every part of which works for one end, the maintenance of order. Our familiar use of *universal*, meaning *general*, is a departure which arose from the notion of comprehensiveness. A university then is simply a corporate body, and has no reference to the wideness of its scope. 'College,' in its old and clas-

sical meaning, is not the material building, but the body of inmates, the *colleagues* who reside together (p. xv). Under the Empire there were *collegia* of augurs, flamens, pontifices, and sacerdotes, each presided over by a *magister* (Tac. 'Ann.' vi. 18), so that what we regard as a mediæval institution is really the perpetuation of a Roman one. Indeed, it is a question whether many of the details of the collegiate plan are not to be referred rather to Rome under the Empire than to mediæval monasticism. Thus 'Senate,' 'Academic,' 'Chancellor,' 'Socius' (Fellow), are, of course, classical and not conventual terms. The actual building was called, in the middle ages, the 'hall' or 'house,' *aula* or *domus* often with the addition of *scholarium*, as Peterhouse was 'domus scholarium sancti Petri,' 'the scholar-house (or scholars' home) of St. Peter.' Modern custom has tended to drop the older and more correct title, and has preferred the more grandiose name of *college*. Thus 'Catharine Hall,' which the founder designated 'a certain house or hall, called the Hall of St. Catharine,' is now 'St. Catharine's College'; Peterhouse is 'St. Peter's College'; Gonville Hall has become Caius College. Clare Hall, we learn (p. xi) was formally changed to Clare College 'by a resolution of the Master and Fellows, January 15, 1856.' Trinity Hall of necessity retains a name distinguishing it from Trinity College. In Hamond's plan of Cambridge, 1592, the title 'collegium' is prefixed to all, followed by 'sive domus,' or, as in most, 'sive aula.' In Loggan's 'Cantabrigia Illustrata' (1688) both Clare and Pembroke are named 'collegium sive aula,' but we have 'Aula D. Catharinæ.' In fact, for about three centuries the terms 'Hall' and 'College,' the building and the residents in it, seem to have been interchangeable.

The *scholares*, who were either *artistæ*, students in arts, or *juristæ*, students in law, were boarded and lodged either at their own cost or as beneficiaries, in the *aula*, or more frequently, it would seem, in 'hostels' or *hospitia*, detached houses or rows of houses belonging to and superintended by the *collegium* or corporation to which these boarding-houses became in early times a necessary adjunct. The term 'hostel' (probably from a diminutive of *hospitium*, i.e. *hospitellum*) still survives, but is now not much in use. In 1530 hostels generally ceased to have independent existence (vol. i. p. 248). *Scholar* and *school* again are classical terms; the *schola* of Cicero was a literary meeting with full *leisure* (σχολή) for the lengthy discussion

of some set topic. The modern schoolboy, who thinks work rather than holiday attaches to the idea of 'school,' will compare the once accepted derivation, *lucus a non lucendo*. The 'Tutor' was the 'protector' of the *scholares*, probably in the sense of a guarantor, *fidejussor*, that their expenses would be paid. Here again a very different notion from the original meaning, viz. that of teaching and instructing, has become the prevalent one.

The true relation of the collegiate to the monastic system, somewhat slight as it is, is well explained in chapter ii. of the Introduction, where the points of likeness and essential difference are clearly set forth. The communities of the early colleges lived under rule, were bound to celibacy, had their chapel (or else what we should call 'sittings in church') and hall or refectory in common, their own separate endowments, rights of privacy, and government under an authorised head. The one point in which a college differed most widely from a monastery was in the invariable use of chambers instead of a dormitory. A college hall is, indeed, like a monastic refectory; but the raised high table and the gallery over the entrance are features borrowed rather from the baronial banquetting room. The primary object of colleges, as non-monastic bodies, was to provide for the secular clergy the benefits of a learned education which the regulars already possessed in their own monasteries. And this object, viz. as a preliminary training for Orders, remained throughout an essential department of the English Universities. Probably for the sake of some secular, or non-scholastic and non-theological, learning, or for more complete training in grammar and canon law, even the monasteries and chapters used in quite early times to send their more promising pupils to reside in some university. As learning began to be less absolutely in the hands of the Church, a number of smaller religious houses and priories, even before the Reformation, were converted into colleges. Interesting examples are given in this work of provisions made at Oxford for the reception of religious in colleges.

The following passage sets this matter—viz. the true relation of colleges to monasteries—in a clear light. As a 'survival of the fittest,' we know that everywhere universities have held their own to this day, while monasticism is, in the main, regarded and treated as an effete system—one that has done good work, but is not likely to do any more.

‘The importance of providing education within the precincts of monasteries, both in England and on the Continent, had engaged the attention of popes and councils from a very early period, and the larger monasteries at least possessed a master (*magister*), whose duty it was to instruct the inmates in grammar, logic, and philosophy, or, as they were called, “the primitive sciences,” just as the secular cathedral bodies had, for the same purpose, their *archischola* or *cancellarius*, the office from which the Chancellor of the University derives his name. When universities came to be established they were resorted to by monks of the different orders, who, if they could not obtain the hospitality of some convent, were obliged, like other students, to reside in hired lodgings. The inconvenience of this close association of regulars with seculars was soon recognised, and special hostels for monks were established at the Universities of Paris, Montpellier, Toulouse, Bologna, &c. We have already noticed the similar foundation for Benedictine students at Oxford in 1287, called Gloucester House (now Worcester College). It may be presumed that these tentative establishments proved successful, for early in the following century monastic colleges were organised on a definite system by the constitutions promulgated in 1335, 1337, and 1339, by Pope Benedict XII. for the reform of the Cistercians, Benedictines, and Augustinians. In each of these codes, amongst various other injunctions, the duty of sending docile scholars of the Order to a university, and of maintaining them while there, is strictly commanded, and enforced by rules. Every Benedictine or Augustinian monastery was compelled to send students to a university in the proportion of one to every twenty of their total number; or more, if their custom had so ordained.’ (Intro. p. xlv.)

Thus it was that the site of Magdalene College was granted by Henry VI. to the Benedictines of England, whose Abbot had represented that they had no hostel or manse of their own at Cambridge.

The monastic students, whether in one or several colleges, were in both universities ‘to be under the common rule of ‘an officer elected annually, called the prior of students’; and the degree of ‘Doctor,’ which meant a teacher of theology and Canon Law (our D.D., and LL.D.), has come down from the middle of the fifteenth century, when the office was maintained at the expense of the monasteries, primarily, it would seem, the Benedictine.

The collegiate system, in the proper sense of incorporated communities, took its rise in the thirteenth century, and seems to have been mainly due to the paramount influence and wealth of monasticism during the whole of that century, when by far the greater part of the still existing abbatial buildings were erected. ‘It was really inaugurated by ‘Walter de Merton, a man of property and influence, Lord ‘High Chancellor of England, and afterwards Bishop of

'Rochester' (p. xxxi). He founded colleges or houses bearing his name both at Cambridge and Oxford, and some remains of the original building at Cambridge still exist (in the Ladies' College at Merton House), which, by the way, appear to have been overlooked in the present work. These were not directly monastic, indeed they seem rather to have aimed at 'benefiting the Church through a better educated 'secular priesthood.' About the same time (1270-80) Balliol College, Oxford, and Peterhouse, at Cambridge, were founded, but there seems no evidence how far they were really appanages to, or designed to supplement the wants of, the great monastic houses. But, if they were distinctively secular, it is hard to believe that they would not have incurred the active opposition of the regulars. Be this as it may, there is no doubt that at Oxford 'Gloucester House' (now Worcester College), founded by John Giffard, in 1283, for 'thirteen student-monks of the Benedictine Abbey of 'St. Peter at Gloucester,' and 'Durham College,' erected by the Abbey of Durham at Oxford about the same time, were essentially 'monastic colleges.' This college is now Trinity College, Oxford, as 'Canterbury College,' founded in 1363 by Archbishop Islip for the Benedictines of Canterbury, is now included in Christ Church (p. lii), and as the Benedictine House at Cambridge of Buckingham College became, under Thomas Lord Audley, the College of St. Mary Magdalene. As late as 1437, Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury, 'founded St. Bernard's College 'for Cistercian student monks,' which preceded by about a year his second foundation of All Souls' College. Still later (1512) the founder of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (Richard Fox, Baronet, of Winchester), 'intended that his college should receive student monks from 'his cathedral-monastery of Winchester, upon the plan 'of Durham College and Canterbury College.' But the change in his plan is very remarkable: he gave up the design, it is said, of benefiting 'a company of bussing 'monks,' and resolved rather 'to provide for the increase of 'learning.'

It is well remarked (vol. iii. p. 248) that the quadrangular plan of a college 'was not made till long after the establishment of the early colleges,' which at first were merely groups of dwelling-houses. This, in fact, was evidently the result of the more complete detachment of the colleges from monastic associations. And as the building of Merton College, Oxford, 'gave birth to the whole system,' so

William of Wykeham's new College in the same university 'served as a model for all the large foundations which were 'subsequently undertaken; and it is from this period that 'the real history of collegiate architecture begins.'

Jesus College, Cambridge, founded by Bishop Alcock of Ely, in 1497, on the suppression of 'the ancient and once 'prosperous nunnery of St. Rhadegund,' is 'the first example 'of the complete conversion of a decayed monastic establish- 'ment into a college, with the retention of the same site and 'buildings, though the alien priories had furnished a con- 'siderable portion of the endowments of the colleges of Eton, 'King's, and Magdalen, Oxford.'

Cardinal Wolsey's great foundation of Christ Church involved 'the suppression of upwards of thirty religious 'houses, including the celebrated Augustinian Priory 'of St. Frideswide, the patron saint of Oxford.' This change was sanctioned by a bull of Pope Clement VII. in 1524, and confirmed to the king not till afterwards. This was not, therefore, the result of a spoliation, but of a well-meant desire to turn abodes of idleness into seats of learning. 'The society, instead of being composed 'of a Master and Fellows after the usual fashion of colleges, 'was to consist of a dean and canons, perhaps in order to 'soften as much as possible the transition from the old to 'the new state of things.' This unique institution, 'under 'the mixed form of a cathedral and a college,' was at first intended to include a school for children, but the latter part of this 'strange scheme' was never carried out.

We have remarked that a college chapel was not at first a part of the collegiate plan; the students resorted to the nearest parish churches.

'All scholars residing at the universities, or at any other place of study, were legally parishioners, for the time being, of the church of the parish in which they happened to be lodged; and as colleges could not aspire to the privilege of a private chapel until they had risen to some importance, no other place than the parish church seems to have been contemplated by the first founders for the devotions of their beneficiaries' (vol. iii. p. 484).

Thus Peterhouse used the 'Church of St. Peter outside 'Trumpington Gates,' till 'Little St. Mary's' (St. Mary's the Less), the elegant decorated structure still existing on the north side of the college, was consecrated in 1352, and there was no separate chapel to this college till the present one was erected, 1628-32. Similarly both Trinity Hall and Clare Hall at first used the church of St. John the Baptist,

and then the former occupied the north, the latter the south chancel aisle of St. Edward's, till Clare obtained a chapel of its own in 1535, which in turn was pulled down and replaced by the present classical design by Sir James Burrough, 1763-69. Corpus Christi at first made use of St. Benet's Church, now well known for its Saxon tower and unique Romanesque belfry arch. Jesus College made use of the old conventual cross-church, a most interesting Early English building, a portion of the nave having been taken down by the founder (Bishop Alcock) to provide room for the Master's lodge.

'One of the earliest colleges in Cambridge into the plan of which a chapel entered from the first' was Pembroke, founded in 1351. 'Previous colleges,' says Professor Willis, 'had been placed as close to parish churches as possible, and had employed them for their devotions.' In this case the foundress, the Countess of Pembroke, obtained from Pope Innocent the Sixth, in 1355, 'permission to build a chapel with an endowment sufficient to maintain a chaplain for ever;' and this permission was confirmed by Pope Urban V. (1366), and by Simon Langham, Bishop of Ely (1365). The necessity for such special licence shows the exceptional nature of a private college chapel. Nevertheless, 'Oratories or small private chapels, licensed under certain conditions, were not uncommon in Cambridge. They were either private to the master or one of the fellows, or appointed for the use of the whole collegiate body.' The first private chapel at Oxford was that at Balliol, 1293; but Queen's (Oxford), in the founder's statutes, of 1340, seems to have the earliest mention of a chapel within the walls as a 'part of the establishment.' But as this chapel was not built till 1382, and not consecrated till 1420, it seems that Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, has precedence in point of date. Nothing is now known of the architectural features of this chapel, but part of the old and rough walling remains in the present library, which dates from 1690. The present (classical) design for a chapel was made by Sir Christopher Wren, nephew of the Bishop of Ely and former Fellow, Matthew Wren, the founder of it in 1664. It has a graceful façade to the street, and, like all Wren's designs, has the merit of excellent proportions, which we justly admire in his noble library at Trinity. The long popularity of Italian or classic designs, which was a carrying out in full of the growing preference for Italian details in works of the Renaissance, was undoubtedly due in a large degree to the singular

genius of Wren, Inigo Jones, Vanbrugh, and the Woods, father and son, of Bath.

We have remarked that the castellated or late Tudor edifices at Cambridge, erected in the early period of the backward movement to Gothic, those, namely, by Wilkins and Rickman, and the designer of the 'Gisborne Court' at St. Peter's, are not of conspicuous merit. They all show a monotonous repetition of embattled octagonal turrets of somewhat meagre proportion flanking the angles and gateways. In the genuine old collegiate buildings these turrets, sometimes square, were very effectively used to carry staircases. Thus both at Eton and Queens' College, Cambridge, 'red brick with stone dressings and square flanking towers' are employed.' The brick turret at Peterhouse, and that till lately existing in the front court at Pembroke, were simply and effectively posed. But the thin turrets in some modern designs seem to require only a good kick to topple them over.

The advocates of Gothic point to the very anomalous character of Gibbs's building at King's, Essex's river front at Queens' and Burrough's building at Peterhouse, as examples of 'wholly incongruous design.' It is not, however, to be denied that for space, convenience, light, and good ventilation, probably even for economy, the Italian style of the Georgian era had great advantages over the Tudor Gothic. Even the debased form adopted by the late Mr. Salvin in the new buildings at Caius, and at Trinity Hall, nearly opposite, has merits in these important respects, as has the new Lodge at St. Catharine's.

The more ornate and somewhat foreign character of Mr. Waterhouse's works at Caius and Pembroke shows a wide departure from the old collegiate type, and may be said to add a new feature to the existing diversity of styles in the university. The Grecian adaptations at Downing, the Observatory, and the Fitzwilliam Museum, and the 'mongrel' new wing of the public library by Cockerell, which involved the destruction of the chief part of the interesting old court of King's College, are perhaps protected from further imitations by the costliness of this kind of work. The architecture of the future, for collegiate purposes, we may venture to predict, will be a happy modification of Elizabethan or Jacobean and the Queen Anne's or Georgian styles. Mr. Basil Champneys and Mr. Fawcett have already carried out some good work of this kind in the university, as has Mr. Scott at Pembroke College, in a modified form.

As might be expected, a large space in this work is devoted to the history and description of King's College chapel, which, taken as a whole, is probably the finest building of its kind in Europe. This noble edifice was the only part of the new college designed by Henry VI. as a sister to his college at Eton that was begun by the founder. 'No other part of the college was touched with the exception of a small portion of foundation at the north-east corner of the great quadrangle. The old court is of course excepted, as belonging to a different college, and not even mentioned in the will of Henry.' This was the college of St. Mary and St. Nicolas, the first stone of which was laid by the king in person, April 2, 1441. The first stone of the chapel was also laid by the king, July 25, 1446.

The chapel itself, 'so far from having been completed during the reign of King Henry VI., was not ready for use for at least half a century after his death.' Indeed, the remarkably conspicuous difference observable in the kinds of stone (the older walling at the eastern end, and in the basement course to the west being magnesian limestone, the rest either Barnack or Clipsham oolite), in itself indicates great changes in the process of building, if not long intervals between the periods of active work.

'In March, 1446, the king had granted to the college a quarry in Thesdale, or Thevesdale, in the lordship of Heselwode, near Tadcaster, in Yorkshire. This he had obtained from Henry Vavasour, together with the right of carriage over his estate to the river Wharfe, so that the stone could be conveyed by water to Cambridge. The supply from Thesdale continued for about three years, when arrangements were made for using the neighbouring quarry of Huddleston' (p. 466).

This is the beautiful creamy-looking stone—not, however, as durable as might be desired, and not to be compared with the Portland in this respect—of which York and Beverley minsters are so largely constructed. The interposition of isolated limestone blocks here and there in the darker upper walling of the chapel has now a very singular appearance; the difference would not have been noticed when the work was new and the two kinds of stone recently dressed, but it has been strongly brought out by weathering, and the different chemical action of the air on the texture of each.

Unfortunately, and unlike the case of Eton College and chapel, 'the contemporary building-accounts having been destroyed, with the exception of one volume extending over a little less than a year, at the end of the reign of King

‘Henry VII., the task of ascertaining the progress of the work is very difficult.’

One would like to know who the architect was that conceived so consummate a design. One fact is very remarkable, and we believe it has not been noticed; whoever designed King’s College chapel must also have designed the Lady Chapel at Peterborough, which was commenced by Abbot Ashton (1438–1471) and completed by Abbot Kirton (1496–1528). It is a smaller and much less lofty structure than King’s chapel, but in the following points the two buildings absolutely agree: the character of the masonry, the treatment and projection of the buttresses, the design of the windows, the basement course, the pierced parapet, above all, the vaulting of fan-tracery. Assuming that the Peterborough vaulting was completed by Kirton about 1520, it would seem to be a later work than that at King’s, which was ‘contracted for in 1512 and probably completed by 1515;’ and Professor Willis calls it ‘a remarkably fine specimen of a fan-vault.’ The extraordinary strength and projection of the buttresses indicate that they were from the first designed to carry a stone vault. On the same principle of comparison, it may be regarded as almost certain that Bath Abbey and the choir of Christchurch, Hants (1500 to about 1520) were designs drawn by the same hand; and what is still more worthy of investigation, the magnificent and unique rood screen in King’s chapel, the highly ornate ‘Salisbury chapel’ of Caen stone at Christchurch, Hants, and Bishop West’s exquisite chapel at the south-east end of Ely Cathedral, all bear such a marked similarity of detail to the tomb of Henry VII. in Westminster Abbey, which is known to be the work of Torrigiano, that it seems safe to attribute all these designs, if not to the same master-hand, at least to artists of his school. The date of them all is within a few years the same, viz. before the middle of the reign of Henry VIII. Mr. Clark remarks in a note: ‘The date of the completion of the rood screen cannot be later than 1536, from the connexion of Anne Boleyn with it,’ i.e. in the initials H. A. carved on the panels. Indeed, the singular beauty and the extraordinary genius shown in these four compositions could hardly have been the conception of more than one master-mind. So far as we know, the designer of the King’s screen, or rood-loft, of dark oak in the Renaissance style, on and over which stands the grand organ, has never been ascertained or perhaps even conjectured. Professor Willis thinks that, ‘to judge by the

‘style, it was executed by foreign, perhaps by Italian, artists’; he admits that the variety in the details of the arabesques and bands of foliage is ‘most exquisite,’ but he has no suggestion to offer as to the designer. The suggestion here made seems worthy of being worked out. A minute examination of the details would finally either verify or disprove it.*

Professor Willis mentions, but without attaching any credit to it, a tradition that the design of King’s chapel was drawn by one Nicholas Close, one of the six original Fellows, and afterwards Bishop of Carlisle; but all that is known is that he was employed as overseer of the works, and received a grant of arms from Henry VI. as a reward of his services. ‘There is no evidence that he had more to do with the building than Langton [John Langton, afterwards Bishop of St. David’s], to whom the honour of having been the architect might with equal justice be assigned, or than Roger Keys, who received a similar grant of arms, had with that of Eton.’

Under Edward IV. and Richard III. the works were continued. In the latter reign (1484) the king directs that ‘the building shall go on with all possible despatch.’

‘The most interesting item is the purchase of glass for the great east window, the window next to it on the north, and the half window next to it on the south. The king sent down his own glazier and plumber to execute the work, and the college provided fish, capons, pigeons, rabbits, and veal for their entertainment’ (p. 474).

It is interesting to know, too, that the glazing of these splendid windows was commenced as early as this. The artists, probably, were from Flanders, where a school of religious painters and engravers was then flourishing. The author remarks (p. 509) that ‘There is no ground whatever for supposing that Dürer’s designs were followed in these windows.’ He gives a most minute account, and at great length, of every fact and document known relating to the completion of these grand works of sacred pictorial art, as well as a full account of the Scriptural subjects represented. It appears from an entry in Will. Dowsing’s diary, that he contemplated a grand smash of ‘one thousand superstitious pictures’ at King’s College, but he appears to have been

* Pietro Torrigiano, the Florentine, left England in 1519, and died in Spain, 1522. He was in great favour with Henry VIII., and it is exceedingly likely that he was employed to make this design, though it may not have been completed till many years after.

‘bought off’ by the magnificent sum of six shillings and eight-pence paid him by the College.

At the death of Richard III., the works were stopped for twenty-four years, after which they were resumed by Henry VII., the very year before his death. ‘A study of the account shows that a staff of about 140 workmen was employed, varying of course slightly in number in each fortnight’ [by which payments were made].

A most interesting document is printed in full at pp. 476–8, being a conveyance to the Provost and scholars of 5,000*l.* ‘to and for the bilding and finishing of the saide church.’

‘This money was probably all spent by the beginning of 1512, when the King’s executors made over to the Provost and scholars, February 8, 1511, 1512, a second sum of 5,000*l.*’ for vaulting, glazing, and woodwork, and ‘these additional funds enabled the college to draw up contracts for the completion of the building.’

‘The cost of the chapel up to this time’ [1515, when it appears to have been finished, exclusive of fittings] ‘cannot be accurately determined, but we have evidence that at least 160,000*l.*, at the present value of money, had been spent upon it’ (p. 481). Altogether the chapel was sixty-nine years in building, the glazing of the windows, and the completion of the stall-work extending to about twenty years later.

A lofty tower (belfry or campanile) was designed as part of a cloister on the west side of the chapel. But

‘there is no evidence that either the cloister or the belfry were ever begun. A drawing, said to be a design for the latter, is preserved in the British Museum. It shows a lofty structure in four stages, of the same area, and of nearly the same height. At each angle there is an octagonal turret, rising considerably higher than the roof, and terminating in a spire of great height, round the base of which there is a battlement and eight pinnacles’ (p. 553).

Professor Willis doubts, from the style, if this composition ever had the authority of the founder. ‘It may possibly,’ he adds, ‘have been made for Henry VII., for it recalls to a certain extent the exterior of his chapel at Westminster.’

A remarkable fact, certainly not generally known, deserves here to be recorded. Many years ago, we think from twenty to thirty, there was a drought for several weeks at Cambridge, and the grass everywhere was completely burnt up and embrowned. Well do we remember, some twenty feet due west of the chapel, being somewhat startled by the apparition

(so to call it) of the ground-plan of a great square tower, buttresses and all, becoming visible on the lawn. Whether the foundations are still there, or the trenching of the soil for laying them, nearly four centuries ago, caused this curious and unexpected appearance, it is difficult to conjecture. It is said that the whole plan of old Sarum Cathedral became similarly visible in a year of long-continued dryness.

In Lyne's map of Cambridge, 1574, a portion of which is engraved (vol. ii. p. 400), a short tower, the coped roof of which reaches only to the level of the side chapels, is plainly represented as standing detached at the west end. Its proportions, however, are quite insignificant in comparison with the chapel, and probably it was used or intended for a belfry, perhaps of framed wood. It is likely enough that it was of this edifice that the foundations in question appeared on the lawn.

The stall-work, including the rood screen, dates 1532-36, and therefore 'it is unlikely that the chapel was used for 'service before those works were completed' (vol. i. p. 497). It is believed that Catholic service on the high altar was never performed, though the accounts are given in full (p. 523) of the costs of making and conveying from London a richly ornamented high altar, which was 'destroyed under 'Edward VI., set up again under Mary, and finally destroyed in the first year of Elizabeth.' But the small vaulted chapels or chantries, carried along both sides between the great buttresses (the two easternmost having evidently been intended for vestries, since they alone in the choir series have doors into the choir), were designed to contain altars, though 'this direction in the founder's will was but 'partially complied with.' Several others of these chantries had altars erected for the repose of the souls of Fellows or Provosts therein interred.

The total cost of the stall-work and screen, as specified in the original plan, exclusive of the value of the timber, is estimated at about 16,000*l.*, according to present value. The will of Henry provides for a rood-loft of given dimensions, but assigns only 100*l.* as the cost. There is 'no evidence that a rood was ever set up upon it.' The organ, which by successive changes and enlargements has grown into the present powerful and magnificent instrument, was set up on the screen in 1606, the name of the maker being Dallam. 'All the materials were brought in 'the rough and made up on the spot,' Dallam and his men

charging 372*l.* for a little over one year's work. But a new organ was built in 1688 by the more celebrated René Harris, at a cost of 350*l.*, and remained till 1803, 'when John Avery 'reconstructed and enlarged it,' and this was further done by Messrs. Hill of London in 1859.

Of the picturesque red brick courts and gateway of Queens' College (1448) Professor Willis gives a most interesting description in vol. ii. In this instance much of his ground had already been gone over by Mr. Searle, in his history of the College. The quadrangle is

'the earliest remaining in Cambridge that can claim attention for real architectural beauty and fitness of design. Plastering, ashlaring, and patching, rendered necessary by the rough construction and perishable materials of the earlier colleges and of many of the later ones, have entirely metamorphosed them, but Queens' College is one of the few that still preserve the aspect and character impressed by the original architect' (vol. ii. p. 12).

The unique and not much altered Master's Lodge, of the same date, is minutely described and illustrated:—

'The whole of the fittings and arrangements belong to the period of Elizabeth or James the First. It is greatly to be regretted that no distinct record of the change can be found in the college books, for this suite of apartments is an exceedingly valuable specimen of the domestic architecture of its period, and of the Cambridge Master's Lodge, especially' (vol. ii. p. 25).

It is rather singular that a timber-built house of nearly the same date still remains in Silver Street, directly opposite the college.*

The college chapel, contemporary with the foundation, had three altars, alternately removed and replaced under Edward VI. and Mary, images, stained windows, and the usual Catholic appurtenances. 'The notorious William Dowsing has left the following record of his proceedings in 1643.'

'At Queens College, Decemb. 26, we beat down a 110 superstitious pictures, besides Cherubims and Ingravings, where none of the fellows would put on their Hatts in all the time they were in the Chapell; and we digged up the steps for three hours, and brake down 10 or 12 Apostles and Saints within the hall' (vol. ii. p. 39).

The 'ditch' along the west side of the College Grove, and separating it from the Common on the other side, is not

* A beautiful drawing of the Lodge, on a large scale, and one of the house in Silver Street, formerly called 'The Three Crowns,' are given in 'Old Cambridge,' by W. B. Redfarn (Cambridge, 1876).

an artificial dyke, we believe, as is generally supposed, but an ancient branch of the Cam, which divided here, so as to make an island of the site of the present gardens on the left bank. It clearly appears as such in Hamond's map of 1592. The two arms of the river, which now have their confluence at King's-bridge, came down from the two ancient mills, and formed continuations of the mill-dams, or rather, of the mill-pond in which they were reunited. But the ancient channel, above the mills, ran through the middle of what is now called 'Sheep's Green,' where it may be traced by a boggy depression fringed with pollard willows. The branch that separates the college on the east side, and now forms the main stream, was widened by the college to 51 feet broad when it came into possession of the site in 1475. As a consequence of widening the one channel, the other became more and more choked with mud and weeds, so that it now has the appearance of a wide shallow dyke. It seems, therefore, hardly correct to say (p. 390) that 'the course of the river Cam was, at least in historic times, the same as it is at present.' It is quite evident that the building of the two mills, which are ancient, materially affected the original course of the river.

The picturesque college of Jesus, with its ancient and most interesting cross church and cloistered court, afforded Professor Willis ample materials for showing his extraordinary sagacity in unfolding the entire history of a building from a few bunches of mouldings and changes in the courses of the masonry.

'A study of the ground-plans,' he says (vol. ii. p. 119), 'shows at once that their distribution differs entirely from that of every other college in the university, and that it has been wholly governed by the structural arrangements of the Nunnery, of which the college is a mere adaptation. The cloistered quadrangle universal in monasteries is possessed by no other college either in Cambridge or Oxford, although many have cloisters in their secondary courts. Wolsey appreciated the convenience of it, and intended to have given a cloister to Christ Church, of which the respond-shafts and wall-ribs still adhere imploringly to the sides of that noble quadrangle, and stamp its architectural effect with the character of an abortive design, notwithstanding the lame attempt to disguise the original purpose of the shafts by continuing them upwards to the string course.'

The conventual church was erected, as Professor Willis infers from the evidence of existing details, between 1150 and 1245. It is therefore considerably the oldest college chapel in either university, the chapel of Merton College,

Oxford, coming next. A stone coffin-lid, still remaining in the pavement, records the burial of one of the Sisters about the end of the 13th century, 'Moribus ornata iacet hic bona Bertha rosata,' where 'rosata' may refer to the flowers thrown into the virgin tomb. The nave, which had side aisles, was shortened, and the still existing eastern arches filled up by masonry on the demolition of the aisles. The Master's Lodge abuts against the west end as thus altered by the founder, Bishop Alcock. Here is an extremely ingenious remark: 'The thickness of the western wall of the lodge seems to mark the west front of the church, although it is now cased externally with brick. It is possible that a fine western door may at some future time be found in this wall.'

While the present generation has seen the complete restoration and decoration of this truly exquisite chapel, the Fellows just a century ago were wasting large sums in Italianising it.

'The oak roof of the choir was concealed by a plaster ceiling, and the tower arcades—i.e. the lantern—by another ceiling, so placed that the bases of their shafts were hidden by it. The eastern archway into the choir was walled up and the entrance adorned with Ionic pillars. In 1815 an agreement was signed to cover the exterior with Roman cement, at a cost of 440*l.*, to be coloured and finished as stonework' (p. 147).

In 1845, however, a thorough restoration, now successfully carried out, was commenced, under the care of Mr. Salvin and Mr. A. Welby Pugin.

The greater part of vol. ii. is devoted to a full account of the noble and wealthy foundations of St. John's and Trinity. The documents are ample, and are for the most part quoted at length; altogether, the narrative is most interesting, and the greatest praise is due to the joint authors for the immense pains they have taken in compiling it.

A drawing in elevation to a scale, in p. 529, shows side by side two compartments in 'Neville's Court,' Trinity, one with its original gablets, designed, it is thought, and erected by Ralph Symons in 1606-14, the other as rebuilt by Essex in 1755. Both are works of genius, the latter being more decidedly classic, the former more Jacobean in character. There is no doubt that Essex had in view the better harmonising with Wren's new library, nor can he be justly blamed. The whole court, flanked as it is by the noble and lofty hall, is a very fine structure—ininitely finer, it will be admitted, than Wilkins's Tudor court adjoining it on the

south. The one blot and eyesore, in our judgment, to the Neville's Court is the Italian 'tribunal' erected (by Grumbold in 1682) against the side of the hall, which it completely and effectually disfigures. It is thought to have been designed or suggested by Wren himself as a set-off to his library. For his credit let us hope not. If such an excrescence has any use or value at present, it can only be as a monument of the bad taste and the depraved fashion for Italianising which then prevailed. To Dr. Bentley, as master of the college, the classic fittings of the chapel, which are certainly most incongruous, are due. One would think that the wooden columns supporting the organ-gallery might be removed, and a structure more in the style of the rood screen at King's substituted. The chapel fittings were completed in 1710. Our authors speak somewhat too favourably of them, as we venture to think, in saying that they were 'designed and carried out in a noble and admirable style, and although out of harmony with the traceried windows and the roof, the discrepancy is amply compensated for by their great beauty.'

The quarrel of the college with Dr. Bentley for his selfish extravagance in beautifying the Lodge is amusingly narrated and the 'severe criticisms' on Dr. Whewell are not withheld, for having caused to be inscribed on the outer wall, that *he*, aided by the munificence of Mr. A. Beresford Hope, had restored the Lodge to its old state; the truth being that not less than £2,500 was contributed to the work by the college.

The most generally interesting chapters of the whole work, perhaps, are the Essays in vol. iii. 'On the Component Parts of a College.' The 'closed monastic quadrangle which, when once introduced, became the characteristic plan of a college until the Reformation,' was pretty uniformly arranged with a gateway, usually with a tower, a chapel on the north, and a hall at right angles to it on the south side. But the open court, i.e. with one side unoccupied by any buildings, as at Jesus and St. Catharine's, had great advantages in sun-light and ventilation; for a small closed court, such as those added to Trinity by Dr. Whewell, cannot possibly, under any circumstances, have the same sanitary advantages. This fact was recognised by Dr. Caius, and the open plan 'was adopted by Sir Christopher Wren and his followers, but probably on account of its superior architectural beauty.' 'At Cambridge the first closed quadrangle containing all the buildings required

‘for the collegiate life was that of Pembroke College, begun ‘immediately after the foundation in 1346.’ Here is a shrewd remark respecting the access to these courts:—

‘At Cambridge the entrance is generally not placed in the exact centre of the side of the quadrangle, the only example of such a symmetrical position having been at St. John’s College. At Oxford, on the contrary, the later colleges have their entrances in the middle of one side, the only unsymmetrical examples being Balliol College, Merton College, Oriel College, Queen’s College, and New College’ (p. 267).

At Cambridge ‘the favourite type of a quadrangle has the ‘hall parallel to, and remote from, the street of entrance, ‘and therefore on the opposite side to the gateway.’ Thus at Queens’, St. John’s, Trinity, the hall stands on the west, at Pembroke and Christ’s on the east because these courts are entered from the west. It is a curious fact, that ‘at ‘Oxford, on the contrary, with the exception of Merton, ‘Jesus, and Lincoln, no hall is placed on the side opposite to ‘the entrance.’

Another ingenious remark is this:—the chapel is usually on the north side in order to reserve the warmer side for chambers, and because the custom of orientation required it to stand from east to west.

Chapter iii. on the ‘Chambers and Studies,’ is full of curious knowledge. ‘According to primitive arrangements, each chamber, with few exceptions, was occupied ‘by several persons, who dwelt, slept, and pursued their ‘studies therein.’ In proof of this, reference is made to the statutes of a large number of colleges in both universities. Hence the term ‘chum’ shortened from ‘chamber-fellow.’ Rather, we should say, from *camerarius*, ‘chamber’ being derived from ‘camera.’ In our times ‘chamber’ is retained for the law-courts, while the residence in colleges is in ‘rooms.’ In p. 307 a plan is given of the upper (or garret) floor in the now destroyed old buildings at Caius, by which it is seen that the ‘study’ was merely a wooden partition in a chamber, each chamber having two such. This therefore offered the only chance of privacy to each occupant. The partitions were very small, ‘about four ‘feet wide, and from five to six feet long.’ A similar plan of chambers and their studies is engraved in p. 309, being the ground-floor of the same ‘Legge Buildings’ at Caius. The studies ‘were not necessarily a part of the structure, ‘but rather of the nature of fixtures which could be set up ‘in the corner of the room against a window, and be removed

'at pleasure' (p. 322). That their origin was monastic, like the cells and 'carrells,' or compartments between the bookstands in libraries, is alleged in p. 326.

The hall arrangements were in many respects very primitive. A lavatory, with towels on hooks for the use of the high table, is recorded in some college accounts; but we are startled at reading of a decree of the Vice-Chancellor and Heads, made in 1571, that if any undergraduate presume to bathe in a river, pond, or any other water within the county of Cambridge, he shall receive

'a severe flogging in public in the common hall in the presence of the fellows, scholars, and all other members of his college; and further, if the delinquent be a bachelor of arts, he is to have his feet tied, to be set in the stocks for a whole day in the common hall of his college, and to pay a fine of ten shillings towards the commons of all the members of the college before he is let out' (p. 364).

The crime of bathing seems to have stood on the same footing as that of stealing or rioting. Another custom, of reading portions of Scripture in hall during meals, was 'evidently borrowed from the monasteries.'

The 'arrangement of three doors, leading to the buttery, kitchen, and pantry respectively, which Professor Willis calls "The triple arcade," was the normal arrangement of a mediæval manor-house, and was copied in most of the older colleges at Cambridge.' It may, however, have come from the almost universal design of the entrance to a monastic chapter-house, consisting of three archways, of which the two lateral lead into cellars or storehouses, or shallow vaulted recesses, the exact object of which has not been ascertained.

Chapter VII., 'The Library,' is an essay of special interest. Before the general use of printing, some four centuries ago, the store of MS. books even in the most literary communities was of course small. The earliest custom seems to have been to keep them in chests, and the authors might have remarked that this was the Roman practice under the Empire. So Juvenal, iii. 206:—

Jamque vetus Græcos servabat cista libellos,
Et divina opici rodebant carmina mures.

Probably the curious iron-clamped church chests still occasionally to be met with, sometimes of great antiquity (as at Wimborne Minster, where there is also one of the few remaining libraries of chained books) were used for containing such books and deeds as belonged to the fabric. In

later times a library became one of the essential buildings.

'The positions of college libraries offer the very curious facts that the great majority of those which were built up to the beginning of the sixteenth century stand with their lateral walls facing east and west; those which were built after this to the end of the Commonwealth, including fourteen examples, face, without exception, north and south' (p. 414).

There can be little doubt that, in days of early rising, the advantages of the morning sun were made available by the eastern position.

When more spacious repositories had been provided for books and MSS., they were kept in cupboards, presses, or 'stalls,' care being taken and various regulations passed for the security of the collection, till at length the ingenious idea occurred of fastening each book to an iron bar by a chain and sliding ring. This practice is fully explained and illustrated from existing examples in pp. 420-39, with curious drawings of the chain-links and the fastenings of the bar along which they were allowed so to slide as to rest on desks at a convenient height from the reader. Beautiful examples of ornamental book-cases in the various colleges are engraved pp. 452-69, from which it appears that no little art and genius in designing were generally expended upon them.

The portraits and busts of founders and benefactors often formed part of the ornament of a library. It might have been added that the 'media Minerva' of Juven. iii. 219, and the 'patrona virgo,' also meaning Minerva as the presiding genius of a library, in Catullus i. 9, illustrate the origin of this custom.

The Master's Lodge, like the Abbot's or Prior's house in a monastery, was a separate establishment, but maintained, of course, at the cost of the college. 'The favourite mediæval arrangement of the Master's Lodging at Cambridge was to place it at the high-table end of the hall in continuation of the latter,' and sometimes a window high in the wall gave a view of the interior of the hall from the lodge. A curious feature of a college lodge was a 'gallery,' often so mentioned in the old records, or corridor.

'The known examples before the end of the reign of Queen Elizabeth are at the following colleges: Trinity Hall, Corpus Christi, King's, Queens', Catharine Hall, Christ's, St. John's, Magdalene, Trinity. In all these lodges, galleries were erected in conformity with

the domestic architecture of the period, when the gallery was a necessary feature of a gentleman's mansion' (p. 339).

We can remember one also at Emmanuel, as part of the Master's Lodge, which has since been removed to another site. Generally, they were used as picture galleries for the portraits of deceased masters and other college worthies. The only two now remaining, and they are very interesting examples, are those at St. John's and Queens'.

Our authors are of opinion that 'that remarkable feature of Cambridge Lodges, the Gallery, which appears to have been unknown at Oxford, proceeded naturally from the cloister of the earlier buildings.' Both were places for indoor exercise, or for walking under cover in the college gardens, composed probably of posts and trellis, on which vines were trained. But we rather doubt the monastic origin of the 'gallery.' Such promenades came from classical times, where the 'porticus' or piazza was used for peripatetic lectures, and the 'cryptoporticus' of a Roman villa, often mentioned in Pliny's Letters, was practically the 'Gallery' of the college. In vol. ii. these appurtenances are described in the old college arrangements of St. John's and Trinity, and much is said about them in connexion with the early plans of other colleges.

We have said so much on the relative claims of Italian and Gothic, chiefly as characteristic of changing fashion and tastes, but partly as dictated by economy or convenience, that we must pass briefly over chapter x. of part iii. on 'The Style of Collegiate Buildings,' thoughtful and sensibly written as it is. The following strikes us as worth quoting:—

'To call the Renaissance a revival of classical architecture is perhaps too strong an expression, for, during the centuries which elapsed between the extinction of that architecture and the decadence of mediæval architecture, a total change had taken place in domestic and social habits, and great improvements had been made in the mechanism of structure, in the art of preparing materials, and in decoration, especially by the introduction of glass. As the temples of the Pagans were unfitted by their structure for the Christian ritual, so their palaces and houses were equally unsuited to the public and private life of the fifteenth century; and the Renaissance is nothing more than a compromise between the desire to reproduce the forms of classical architecture which classical literature had brought into favour, and the necessity of retaining the structural arrangements which were too intimately connected with the building arts, and the habits and customs of society, to be abandoned.'

The decline of the feudal system, and of the custom of

living, for security's sake, in moated houses—low, damp, dark, and inconvenient, as well as unhealthy—led to the Elizabethan and Jacobean mansion, with its imposing gateway, its gabled and turreted walls, and numerous mullioned often projecting square or semicircular bay windows. The defiant stronghold and the gloomy prison of the Edwardian castle now became, with more cultured and literary tastes, a hospitable château and a mansion directed to social conveniences rather than to personal security. And as the colleges followed in the main the arrangements of the manor house or baronial hall, so the Renaissance offered a pleasing relief from the somewhat gloomy aspect of the older college courts, as existing at Queens', Jesus, and St. John's. The introduction of foreign artists, and the greater intercourse with Italy and the Continent generally, assisted in establishing the Renaissance as a recognised style during the reign of Henry VIII.

Our authors add :—

'The mode in which the new decorative forms were introduced, by the gradual and increasing application of them, in successive buildings, to the accustomed mechanical arrangements of the structures, is exhibited in the two English universities with peculiar distinctness. They each present a group of numerous buildings exhibiting every phase of the transition, for the most part of known date, and, further, executed by architects mentioned by name, whose influence can be traced in successive works' (p. 526).

The earliest, and by far the most beautiful, of the Italianising works at Cambridge is the incomparable design of the rood screen in King's chapel—a design we have already spoken of as possibly a masterpiece of Pietro Torrigiano.

We have sometimes felt doubtful, in quoting from this work, whether the words were those of Professor Willis or of Mr. Clark, the distribution of the bracketed portions being not always quite clear. But where such high praise is due, the two names may be allowed to share it in common, and Mr. Clark will readily forgive us if we have not been very accurate in the distinction.

- AET. IV.—1. *Auroræ: their Characters and Spectra.* By J. RAND CAPRON, F.R.A.S. London: 1879.
2. *Das Polarlicht.* Von HERMANN FRITZ. Leipzig: 1881.
3. *Verzeichniss beobachteter Polarlichter.* Zusammengestellt von HERMANN FRITZ. Wien: 1878.
4. *Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis.* By SOPHUS TROMHOLT. Edited by CARL SIEWERS. London: 1885.
5. *Observations of International Polar Expeditions: Fort Rae.* By Captain HENRY P. DAWSON, R.A. Published by the Royal Society. London: 1886.

OUR earth, there is no doubt, is to some extent a self-luminous body. It is not wholly dependent for its light-supplies upon sunshine, direct or reflected. Thin remnants, possibly of an ancient clothing of fire, still partially kindle round it. Moreover, these terrestrial flame-processes vary both in intensity and distribution. Nor altogether without method. They wax and wane in accordance with a highly complex law of periodicity, the disentanglement of which from apparently boundless confusion, and its reference to wider cosmical changes, are amongst the most characteristic discoveries of our time.

Under the designation 'Aurora Borealis' Gassendi included, in 1621, the luminous appearances vaguely and variously described by ancient and mediæval writers as 'chasmata,' 'trabes,' 'faces,' 'capra saltans,' 'draco volans,' etc. The bestowal of the name was in itself no slight help towards a better understanding of the phenomenon. No longer a mere portent, it assumed thenceforward the character of a scientific problem. Curiosity on the subject largely superseded fear. Above all, some degree of distinctness was introduced into ideas about it, and accounts of its apparitions grew less bewildered; the older records often leaving it profoundly uncertain whether they refer to auroral arches and streamers, to comets, brilliant meteors, or even to conspicuous manifestations of the Zodiacal Light.

In general, however, we are safe in giving an auroral interpretation to the chronicled spectral battles, when

'Fierce fiery warriors fought upon the clouds,
In ranks, and squadrons, and right form of war,'

such as were widely seen during the disastrous Cimbrian campaign of 113 B.C.; again at Rome,

'A little ere the mightiest Julius fell';

and such as Josephus describes among the presages of the destruction of Jerusalem.

Celestial conflagrations, too, may be unhesitatingly set down to the same cause. In 450 A.D., just before the irruption of Attila into Italy, the sky (Isidore of Seville narrates) 'turned red, as if with fire or blood;' and a 'blazing of the heavens' was quite a common sight in the following century, when St. Gregory of Tours wrote his '*Historia Francorum*.' The illusion, indeed, has sometimes been complete. Thus, in the reign of Tiberius, the cohorts hastened to the relief of Ostia, believed to be a prey to actual flames from the lurid glow hanging over it*; bodies of firemen were called out under similar circumstances in Paris, September 28, 1827; and in the rural parts of England, the crimson aurora of October 24, 1870, was explained as the reflection of a vast Prussian bonfire fed by the beleaguered French capital.

In Ireland, such fires turn to streams of blood. The slain at Balaklava were supposed, by the inhabitants of Berehaven, in the county of Cork, to have provided a show of northern lights visible in the autumn of 1854; and French blood flowed similarly, it was thought, in 1870.† So that there is some reason for holding a red aurora to be commemorated in the shower of blood (lasting, according to one authority, three days and three nights) which celebrated the battle of 690 A.D., between the septs of Leinster and Ossory.‡ The omen was emphasized by the sanguine hue assumed by butter, and by the human utterances of a wolf.

Not all antique 'showers of blood' can, it is true, be identified as auroræ. Abnormal rains were, in those days, too frequent and too fantastically various for profitable enquiry as to the grain of fact they conceal. Meteoric falls, luminous appearances, with aqueous showers tinged red by the presence of a microscopic alga (*Palmella prodigiosa*), have each a share which it would usually be mere waste of time to attempt to apportion. The bloody dews, however, by which Zeus celebrated the death of Sarpedon and the combat of Heracles with the robber Cycnus, may probably be referred to the last class of phenomena; § nor is there to be found in any of the poems attributed to Homer and Hesiod a genuine vestige of an auroral reminiscence.

* Seneca, *Quæst. Nat.*, lib. i. cap. xv.

† Kinahan, '*Nature*,' vol. iii. p. 105.

‡ *Annals of the Four Masters*, p. 295.

§ Paley's *Hesiod*, '*Shield*,' 884-5.

The first mention of an aurora borealis in England is by Matthew of Westminster, who states that in the year 555 A.D. 'an appearance as if of lances was seen in the air,' extending from the north as far as the west.* Similar entries recur with tolerable frequency in the 'Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' and the 'Chronicum Scotorum.' A wider survey of such records shows them to be distributed with curious inequality over the centuries they embrace. No caprices of ignorance or unobservance will account for such wide intervals of scarcity as Professor Hermann Fritz's great Catalogue of auroræ discloses. Fluctuations are obvious in the phenomenon itself, by which, during certain periods, it died down almost to extinction in Central Europe; then by its sudden revival astounded an unaccustomed generation. One of the longest and best authenticated of these pauses occurred in the seventeenth century. It is a remarkable fact that during its course not a single aurora was witnessed in any part of England, notwithstanding the keen watch kept by the Baconian philosophers of the Royal Society. The intermission (with one trifling exception in 1709) lasted, indeed, 142 years. On the night of October 7, 1574, 'burning spears' appeared above London; and on November 14 and 15 following, Stow relates that 'divers strange impressions of fire and smoke were seen in the air,' and that 'the heavens from all parts did seem to burn marvellous ragingly.'† The ensuing prolonged silence as to such phenomena was at last broken by the clamour of mingled wonder, awe, and admiration which greeted the resumption of auroral activity on March 17, 1716. Halley, afterwards Astronomer-Royal, communicated to the Royal Society a detailed account of this fine display, an extract from which we here, with slight abbreviation, insert.

'On Tuesday, March 6 (o.s), in the current year 1716, about the time it began to grow dark—that is, much about seven of the clock—not only in London, but in all parts of England where the beginning of this wonderful sight was seen, out of what seemed a dusky cloud, in the north-east parts of the heaven, and scarcely 10° high, the edges whereof were tinged with a reddish-yellow like as if the moon had been hid behind it, there arose very long luminous rays or streaks perpendicular to the horizon, some of which seemed nearly to ascend to the zenith. Presently after, that reddish cloud was swiftly propagated along the northern horizon into the north-west, and still further westerly; and immediately sent forth its rays after the same manner from all parts,

* Annals of Philosophy, vol. ix. p. 250.

† Annales of England, p. 678.

now here, now there, they observing no rule or order in their rising. Many of these rays seeming to concur near the zenith, formed there a corona, or image which drew the attention of all spectators, who, according to their several conceptions, made very differing resemblances thereof: but by which compared together those that saw it not may well comprehend after what manner it appeared. Some likened it to those radiating stars wherewith the breasts of the most noble Knights of the Garter are adorned. Many compared it to the concave of the great cupola of St. Paul's church, distinguished with streaks alternately light and obscure, and having in the midst a space less bright than the rest, resembling the lantern: and some there were that thought it liker to that tremulous light which is cast against a ceiling by the beams of the sun, reflected from the surface of water in a basin that's a little shaken; whose reciprocal vibrating motion it very much imitated. But all agree that this spectrum lasted only a few minutes, and showed itself variously tinged with colours, yellow, red, and a dusky green. Nor did it keep in the same place; for when first it began to appear, it was seen a little to the northwards of the zenith, but declining towards the south, the long stræ of light, which arose from all parts of the northern semicircle of the horizon seemed to meet together not much above the head of Castor, or the northern Twin, and there soon disappeared.

'After the first impetus of this ascending vapour was over, the corona we have been describing appeared no more; but still, without any order as to time, or place, or size, luminous radii like the former appeared to rise perpendicularly, now oftener, and again seldomer, now here, now there, now longer, now shorter. Nor did they proceed as at first out of a cloud, but oftener would emerge at once out of the pure sky, which was at that time more than ordinary serene and still. Nor were they all of the same form. Most of them seemed to end in a point upwards, like erect cones; others, like truncate cones or cylinders, so much resembled the long tails of comets, that at first sight they might well be taken for such. Again, some of these rays would continue visible for several minutes; when others, and those much the greater part, just showed themselves and died away. Some seemed to have little motion, and to stand, as it were, fixed among the stars, whilst others, with a very perceptible translation, moved from east to west, under the pole, contrary to the motion of the heavens; by which means they would sometimes seem to run together, and at other times to fly one another; affording thereby a surprising spectacle to the beholders.'*

In a time of civil disturbance, the sensation created by these uncommon appearances inevitably took a party tinge, and Whigs and Tories divided over the aurora as they had wrangled over Dr. Sacheverell and the peace of Utrecht. The Jacobites muttered that such portents boded no good

* Phil. Trans., vol. xxix. p. 407.

to the new dynasty. They talked of giants with flaming swords, fiery dragons, embattled armies; the more imaginative, or the more rebellious, averring that they had heard the report of fire-arms, and smelt the powder burnt by the spectral combatants. The cue of the Hanoverians, on the other hand, was to make light of the whole affair as a mere natural phenomenon. The 'Flying Post,' remarking that 'the disaffected party have worked this up to a prodigy, and interpret it to favour their cause,' proceeded to write it down to the level of sulphurous exhalations, kindled vapours, and will-o'-the-wisp coruscations from the fens! *

It proved, however, to be no transient appearance, this 'Great Amazing Light in the North' (as the almanacs called it). Its frequency is vouched for by a tract published in 1741 with the title: 'An O-Yes, from the Court of Heaven to the Northern Nations, by the Streaming Lights that have appeared of late years in the Air; or Mathematical Reasons, showing that the said Lights are no less than Supernatural.' In the Lowlands of Scotland the name they long went by, of 'Lord Derwentwater's Lights,' served at the same time to mark their previous unfamiliarity and to recall their occurrence on the eve of the execution of the rebel lords Derwentwater and Kenmure, February 23, 1716.

On the Continent, during the seventeenth century, displays of the kind were scarce, but not unknown. That witnessed by Gassendi, September 12, 1621, extended as far south as Aleppo; 'whole armies,' according to Cromerus, traversed the sky, December 16, 1629; Cassini observed auroræ several times in Paris early in July 1687; and Horrebow, about the same period, saw one at Copenhagen. Yet it is significant of the rarity of the phenomenon that he saw it then for the first time; and Descartes, although he lived twenty years (1629-49) in Holland, and paid special attention to all meteoric appearances, never saw it at all.

Towards the close of the century polar lights almost disappeared from all parts of the world accessible to scientific enquiries. They still glimmered here and there in the far north, but their old intensity was gone. Even in Iceland they grew by scarcity to be prodigious. On their brilliant apparition at Copenhagen in 1709,† the guard turned out under arms in readiness for some imminent catastrophe;

* R. G. in 'Nature,' vol. iii. p. 46.

† Two arcs, observed by Römer in 1707, were probably inconspicuous.

their revival was greeted in St. Petersburg with stupefaction; at Bologna, they were supposed to have been unknown until 1723. Auroræ seen in China in 1718, 1719, and 1722, excited so much amazement, that engravings of them were struck off in thousands and were secretly (portents being contraband inside the Great Wall) diffused throughout the Empire.*

The next prolonged period of scarcity began in 1794, and lasted a third of a century. Since 1827, auroræ have been frequent and splendid in these latitudes, with occasional extensions to tropical, and sympathetic responses from austral regions. Northern streamers were seen in 1848 at Rome, Odessa, and Smyrna; in 1870 at Bagdad and in the Canary Islands; the great outbreaks of August and September 1859 wrapped the whole globe, with the exception of an equatorial belt forty degrees across, in lambent flames; those of February 1872 and of November 1882 emulated their vividness and extent.

The luminosity of our planet, then, is of a markedly variable character; and its variability, we now know, is not inherent, but induced. Its law is imposed by overruling external influences.

Auroræ are subject to at least four distinct periods, each one of which owns a solar dependence. The discovery in 1852 of the marvellous agreement between the more or less spotted condition of the sun and the greater or less amplitude of the daily excursions of the magnetic needle, could not but suggest the probability of synchronous fluctuations in polar lights. For by that time their magnetic relations were perfectly well established. Halley's explanation of them by 'magnetical effluvia,' which 'by a kind of circulation surround a magnet on all sides, as with an atmosphere, to the distance of some diameters of the body,' and might 'now and then, by the concurrence of several causes very rarely coincident, and to us as yet unknown, be capable of producing a small degree of light,'† was (in his own phrase) a 'conceit.' Not a single fact was or could then be adduced in its favour. It was a shot fired, it might be said, in the dark; yet it was well on the target, and came curiously near hitting the bull's-eye.

Celsius and Hiorter noticed at Upsala in 1741 that the darting of northern streamers was attended by spasmodic

* De Mairan, '*Traité de l'Aurore Boréale*' (2nd ed.), p. 465.

† Phil. Trans. vol. xxix. p. 428.

movements of the magnetic needle. Subsequent observations have amply borne out the coincidence, which, in these latitudes, is well-nigh invariable. Magnetic disturbances sometimes, indeed, occur without visible auroræ, but auroræ most rarely without magnetic disturbances. Nearer the pole, however, the tie is somewhat loosened. There a tranquil arch of light may rest above the horizon for hours without perceptible effect upon the magnetic instruments. They usually grow restless only when the arch shifts its position, or streamers begin to play.

But evidence of sympathetic agitation does not alone testify to the existence of a close bond uniting auroræ with the terrestrial magnetic system. There is, besides, a fundamental analogy of structure.

Auroræ of the active kind are, in aspect, amongst the most capricious of natural phenomena. They are full of individualities and vagaries. No two are alike; no single one is often like itself during many successive minutes. Nevertheless, there are certain broad lines of construction to which all more or less conform. And these broad lines are laid down with obvious and invariable reference to the position of the earth's magnetic pole. This leading fact was partially indicated by Wilcke in 1787, and by Ussher in 1788; but was fully and independently brought out by John Dalton, then (in 1792) a poor schoolmaster in Kendal, but famous later as the discoverer of the atomic theory.

The first symptom of an aurora borealis is commonly a low arch of greenish light placed astride of the magnetic meridian. That is to say, it is symmetrical (not always strictly so) with regard to the direction of the compass needle, its middle point bearing, in this country, some eighteen degrees west of north. The radiated structure observed in certain arches is a symptom of more than ordinary intensity; most are composed of quiet, homogeneous light. The space they enclose is called the 'dark segment.' It presents a peculiar appearance of blackness; yet it is no ordinary cloud, since stars shine brightly through it. Nor is it a simple effect of contrast. It has been seen to form in twilight, and its appearance has been known to precede that of the subsequent bordering radiance, which is, moreover, quite capable of leaving it behind, as it independently climbs the sky.

Multiple arches are common in high latitudes. As many as nine were visible together to the members of the French Scientific Commission at Bossekop in 1838-9; and Weyprecht

describes seven in slow simultaneous movement during a display above the ice-tracts round Franz Josef's Land. Energetic auroræ invariably travel, movement affording them, as it were, the opportunity for the development of their characteristic spectacular effects.

A large share in these belongs to the 'streamers.' No auroral exhibition can be called complete without them, and in their fitful and flickering play auroral folklore has mainly originated. Their beams were the paths along which the old Norsemen saw the Valkyries return to Valhalla; they are still the elfish 'merry dancers' of the Shetland islanders; Eskimos, Indians, Tunguses view in them the ghostly gambols of their dead; they are the coursers preferred by spirits of whatever nationality who fancy 'riding the Northern light.'

To the glitter of rapid movement they add, in many cases, the charm of vivid colouring. All the hues of the rainbow—crimson and gold, emerald-green, tender rose-tints—blend and flash in iridescent interchange above a silvery or deep violet background. Sometimes the dazzling effect is heightened by the admixture of beams of intense blackness rolling upwards from the horizon like masses of dense smoke. These are evidently a part of the unexplained phenomenon of the dusky segment. The motions of the streamers are of bewildering variety and inestimable velocity. The eye absolutely refuses to follow them, and is often at a loss to determine their direction. It gazes helpless, yet delighted, at the emulous race of prismatic shafts of which the heavens are the arena. The goal of the race is the magnetic zenith. For, with all their seeming waywardness, these flashing coruscations are in reality under the rigid control of a fixed law. They conform with scrupulous fidelity to the line of force indicated by the swing of the dipping needle.

A magnetized needle, freely poised, takes up a position, here in London, differing by only twenty-two degrees from the vertical. Its south pole is directed eighteen degrees west of true north; its north pole aims upwards towards a point in the sky twenty-two degrees from the zenith, and eighteen degrees east of south. This is the 'magnetic zenith'; here is the rendezvous of auroral streamers, and here the 'corona' forms when polar lights develope in full perfection.

Then the fluctuating torrents of light which inundate the sky seem to meet for some brief culminating moments under a canopy of milder and steadier radiance. 'Seem to meet' only. Their apparent convergence is an effect of perspective on parallel beams. Hence a corona can never form unless

the direction of the streamers coincides with the spectator's line of vision. It is accordingly a *sine quâ non* that the central plane of the display should cross the zenith. No sooner, however, is this condition fulfilled, than the streamers rush together from all quarters to form the crowning decorative glory of an aurora borealis.

This enchanting spectacle was first described by St. Gregory of Tours in the year 585.* He compared the effect to that of a radiant pavilion of light draping the sky. But such a consummation of brilliancy is rarely witnessed south of Paris. Only exceptionally intense auroræ travel so far from their arctic home as to be actually overhead at forty-five degrees from the pole.

Another variety of the phenomenon is confined almost exclusively to high latitudes. This is the peculiarly beautiful kind known as the 'draped aurora.' A modification of the arc or band, it is composed of closely planted ranges of nearly vertical rays—rays, that is, set in the line of the magnetic inclination—and seems to hang, in folded and festooned sheets of waving luminous drapery, close above the heads of the beholders. It is brilliantly coloured with red and green, the red, according to Weyprecht, being always below.

We can now see how inevitable it was that the close magnetic relations of the aurora should be drawn closer by a coincidence of period. Anticipated in various quarters immediately on the discovery of sunspot periodicity, the concurrence was established by Fritz in 1862, and confirmed, from American sources of information, by Loomis in 1870 and 1872. But it is obvious that an eleven-yearly minimum will not explain the long intermissions of activity certified by auroral records. There must be besides a huge groundswell of frequency and decline, upon the back of which the eleven-year cycle is borne as a lesser wave of change. A 'secular period' of sixty-five years was accordingly announced by Olmsted in 1856,† without any reference to solar conditions, which were, however, a little later found to conform to a similar law. There can, indeed, be little doubt that auroræ, sunspots, and, we may safely add, magnetic disturbances, obey a common period of many decades, as well as one of about eleven years, although the precise number of those decades be still somewhat uncertain. The Zürich astronomers (R. Wolf and Fritz) hold to fifty-five and a half

* Hist. Francorum, lib. viii. cap. 16.

† Smithsonian Contributions, vol. viii.

years. Their authority is considerable, and may provisionally be deferred to. Yet it is probable that further complications exist, demanding perhaps centuries for their thorough unravelment.

To this double periodicity depending upon the state of the sun, corresponds a double periodicity depending upon his position. It is difficult to consult any detailed register of auroral appearances without being struck with their predominance at certain seasons of the year. This was noticed by De Mairan in 1745, and it has been confirmed by the closest enquiry that auroral maxima occur near both equinoxes, and auroral minima about the solstices. The phenomenon is besides found to be more common over the entire globe while the earth is passing through the perihelion side of its orbit—that is, during the six months which include our winter season—than while it traverses the further section; whence it appears that its development is promoted by nearness to the sun. When we add that auroræ have a daily maximum between 9 and 10 P.M. markedly retarded as the magnetic pole is approached, we have completed the sketch of their better-known fluctuations.

It remains, if possible, to explain them, and in this direction, too, something has been done.

The proper habitat of the aurora borealis is in a zone about twelve degrees of latitude in width, encircling at a considerable distance both the magnetic and astronomical poles of the earth. Within its borders the phenomenon is of almost nightly occurrence, and appears indifferently either to the north or to the south of the spectator; beyond them, on the southern side, it shows, as a rule, in the north, on the northern side in the south, growing progressively scarcer in both directions. At the magnetic centre, auroral arcs are mostly, in sea-going phrase, ‘hull down,’ and polar lights vanish at the pole.

This theory of auroral distribution is essentially that proposed by Hansteen in 1825.* It has since been corroborated by the experience of arctic voyagers, and by the enquiries of Professors Fritz and Loomis. The system of ‘isochasms,’ or lines of equal auroral frequency, constructed by the former in 1868, and reproduced in his valuable little work on auroræ, named at the head of this article, portrays to the eye with very approximate accuracy the geographical relations of the phenomenon. As slightly irregular ovals, these lines surround the ‘auroral pole,’ a point intermediate between the astro-

* Edin. Phil. Journal, vol. xii. p. 83.

nomical and magnetic poles, lying north of Baffin's Bay, in latitude 80° north, longitude 81° west.* So that curves to which it is central descend much lower on the American than on the Asiatic continent. Hence the great rarity of such displays in Central Asia, the same parallel of latitude being there very much farther from the auroral pole than on the other side of the world. The isochasm, for instance, marked 0.1 on the chart—the line, that is to say, where one aurora on an average is visible every ten years—crosses Mexico and Cuba, touches Cadiz, ascends to the Caspian and the Sea of Aral, and reaches the Pacific, leaving Japan on the south, by the Kurile Islands. Thus, at Pekin, not even the far-spreading auroræ of 1870 and 1872 were noticed; and similar displays are as commonly seen in Florida as on Lake Baikal. The maximum belt runs from Point Barrow over the Great Bear Lake to Hudson's Bay, passes south of Cape Farewell, between Iceland and the Farøe Islands, almost meets the North Cape, and just grazes Novaya Zembla on the north, Wrangel Land on the south. On the pole-ward side of this line there is a rapid falling off; and arches appear, if at all, above the *southern* horizon.

During his winter sojourn at Behring's Straits in 1878-9, Baron Nordenskiöld was forcibly struck with the unfailing presence and invariable aspect of an arc, the feeble luminosity of which served to mitigate the darkness wrapping the isolated watchers from the 'Vega.' The conclusion at last forced itself upon him that what he saw was but a portion of a complete and permanent ring of light, some two thousand kilometres in diameter, centred upon the auroral pole. The lateness of its recognition was accounted for by its inconspicuousness or invisibility save from some of the least accessible regions of the globe.

Observations of a wider range have shown that the nimbus imagined by the Swedish explorer does not indeed exist in the form which he attributed to it, but that it has a close representative in the auroral maximum zone described above. Here the conditions of luminosity are most fully developed, though they are not always, or everywhere, called into activity. Instead of a tranquil halo, unchangeably decorating the summit of our globe, we have a band fitfully lit up, in sections, by flashing fragments, at capricious intervals of time and space.

* According to Nordenskiöld. Fritz places it some ten degrees further east.

Now the position of this band is not fixed. It moves to and fro, alternately north and south, after a singular and complicated fashion. The discovery of these movements was originated by the late Lieutenant Weyprecht as the result of his voyage in the 'Tegethoff' in 1872-4, and has been confirmed and extended by M. Tromholt. It is a very remarkable one.

For it is to them that the periodicity of auroral appearances is immediately due. As the main zone of their development travels south they become abundant in temperate climates, as it retreats north they grow scanty or disappear. But these conditions are exactly reversed in the vicinity of the pole. There, when the auroral zone is in a comparatively low latitude, auroræ are few and feeble; they regain intensity and frequency when it swings back so as to be more nearly overhead. Hence an arctic maximum corresponds to a temperate minimum, and an arctic minimum to a temperate maximum. All the facts so far collected go to support this hypothesis of oscillation. M. Tromholt's study of the phenomenon during fifteen years (1865-1880) at Godthaab in north Greenland,* compelled the conclusion that the relation between sunspots and auroræ established by observations in middle latitudes, is there precisely inverted. At Godthaab a sunspot maximum is attended by an auroral scarcity, just because the auroral zone is then at the southern extremity of its eleven-yearly swing.

The annual period is similarly reversed. Our winter-solstice minimum is converted into a polar maximum; our spring and autumn maxima into minima. Near the summer solstice, it is scarcely necessary to remark, such observations are, within the arctic circle, rendered impossible by unbroken daylight.

Even the diurnal fluctuations of auroræ show the effects of this oscillatory behaviour. The hour of culminating intensity grows later with increasing magnetic latitude. At Prague, it is 8h. 45m. P.M.; at Oxford, 9h. 15m.; at Kendal, 9h. 45m.; at Christiania, 10h.; at Fort Simpson (in 62° N. lat.) 12h.; at Point Barrow (in 71° N. lat.) 1h. 12m. A.M. The auroral zone, in fact, *moves northward during the night*. That this is no mere hypothesis, but an actual fact, is proved by M. Tromholt's observation, that in the morning hours auroræ occur at Godthaab predominantly

* The practical part of the enquiry was conducted by Mr. S. Kleinschmidt.

in the zenith, but in the evening show chiefly towards the south.*

Thus, each variation in time is attended and explained by a shifting in space, with a resulting series of movements of a highly intricate character. The motive power evidently resides in the sun. But, no less evidently, the entire solar influence is not expended in producing this zonal displacement. Changes of intensity as well as of position progress concurrently with the vicissitudes of the spot-cycle. The great universal auroræ, which enfold both hemispheres in simultaneous flames, and are accompanied by violent electrical and magnetic disturbances, never, so far as is yet known, occur save when the sun's activity is at a high pitch; they are indeed often visibly associated with conspicuous solar convulsions. Scarlet auroræ, too, belong more particularly to times of spot-maximum; while, with the decline of solar energy, displays tend to become localised, and even in polar regions the quiet arch probably prevails over the auroræ of rushing streamers and brilliant draperies.

Nevertheless, the *geometrical* rationale of auroral periodicity offered by M. Tromholt is true so far as it goes, and constitutes a very important addition to knowledge, especially when brought into connexion with the only satisfactory theory of the nature of polar lights yet advanced. This was published by Professor Edlund of Stockholm eight years ago.† We believe that it needs only to be understood to be generally accepted.

A magnet surrounded by a rotating cylinder of some conducting substance produces a disturbance of its electrical equilibrium, giving rise, if wires be suitably connected, to a current, the direction of which depends upon that of the rotation. If the magnet rotate with the cylinder, the effect will be the same. This phenomenon of 'unipolar induction' was discovered in 1841 by the great German electrician, the friend of Gauss, Wilhelm Weber. We are not here concerned to explain it, nor would it be easy, in the absence of any certain knowledge as to what actually constitutes an electric current; but the fact is a well-ascertained one.

Now the rotating earth may be regarded as a magnet wrapped in the conducting strata of its crust; while the upper layers of the atmosphere complete the circuit. Rarefied air, it must be remembered, transmits electricity with ease;

* 'Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis,' vol. i. p. 273.

† Phil. Mag. vol. vi. (5th series).

although dense, dry air is a non-conductor. One effect of the forces thus brought into play is that positive electricity is continually expelled from the earth's surface into the higher atmosphere, the earth itself remaining negatively charged. Another is that the expelled positive electricity travels without ceasing from the equator towards the poles. The first result is due to what is called the 'vertical component' of magnetic induction, which acts most strongly at the equator; the second to the 'tangential component,' which attains maxima about midway between the equator and each pole. Plainly, however, this accumulation of opposite electricities on the earth and in its atmosphere cannot go on indefinitely. It must be attended by some process of neutralisation. How is this effected? We can answer at once as regards the tropical belt of the globe. When the tension reaches a certain point, it relieves itself by a disruptive discharge. In ordinary parlance, a thunderstorm takes place. Violent remedies, however, are not always the most effective; and a thunderstorm, although in certain localities, and at certain seasons, an everyday event, can only occur under favouring meteorological conditions. It is then probable that recomposition of the positive fluid (to use a convenient if somewhat antiquated phrase) of the air with the negative fluid of the earth is accomplished, only to a very limited extent, by the agency of lightning. The greater part of the expelled electricity flows silently poleward, constantly reinforced by fresh supplies gathered *en route*, and waiting an opportunity of relief from increasing pressure. With the disclosure of how that opportunity is found, we believe the chief part of the secret of the polar aurora is told.

Two obstacles impede the passage of electricity from the upper atmosphere to the earth. The first is the difficulty it experiences in crossing the subjacent strata of non-conducting dense air. The second is the repellent force of magnetic induction. Now, Professor Edlund's calculations show that this repellent force is inoperative along the direction indicated by the dipping needle. Here, then, is the line of least resistance always sought by an electric current—the ladder, as it were, raised from the earth to the sky for the descent of the urgent fluid. But at the equator no such ladder is raised; there the needle swings horizontal, and there, accordingly, a discharge can only take place in direct opposition to the magnetic resistance. At the magnetic poles, on the other hand, where the position of the needle is vertical, this kind

of resistance disappears; while in intermediate latitudes its value changes through all possible gradations.

We can now see clearly what must happen. Over a ring-shaped space round each pole, defined by the nearly equal intensity throughout its extent of the vertical component of terrestrial induction, the electricity of the upper air, having now attained a 'potential' sufficient to enable it to overcome its waning resistance, flows quietly to the earth. This 'district of recomposition' (if we may so call it) corresponds precisely to Hansteen's auroral zone. Moreover, the discharges which occur within it follow unerringly the line of the dipping needle. That is to say, they coincide to a hair's breadth with the direction of auroral streamers. When we find, further, that electrical currents transmitted through rarefied air accurately reproduce to the eye the luminous effects of auroræ, the identification becomes inevitable. The resemblance is drawn even closer when such currents are brought under magnetic influence. A remarkable experiment of M. de la Rive's showed, in 1853,* that when positive and negative electricities are caused to unite near the pole of an electromagnet, a miniature auroral arch displays itself in the form of a luminous ring encircling the pole.

Auroræ may then be briefly described as electric discharges through highly rarefied air, taking place in a magnetic field, and under the sway of the earth's magnetic induction. They are part of a general system of electrical circulation, not, we may be sure, without important uses in the economy of our globe. Positive electricity, driven upwards from its surface in middle and low latitudes, flows on either hand towards the poles, until the enfeeblement of resistance permits its descent and reunion with the negative electricity of the earth along two zones central with the magnetic poles. This recomposition occurs for the most part imperceptibly, aided by the fogs and moisture of polar climates; but the process is at times rendered partially visible by the lighting up of the thin air which is its seat. Then the more tranquil and unintermittent portion of the discharge gathers into a luminous circle—or arc of a circle—with the magnetic pole for its centre, seen from the earth as an arch resting upon the horizon; while transient currents flash as 'streamers' along the path prescribed for them by the line of the magnetic dip.

Strongly confirmatory of this view is the fact that, within

* Archives des Sciences, t. xxiv. p. 371.

the auroral zone, atmospheric electricity is of the feeblest character. In other words, neutralisation having been already completely effected, there is no longer any appreciable difference of tension between the earth and the air.

The migratory character of the zones of frequency upon which auroral periodicity depends, takes a new meaning from the theory we have been endeavouring to explain. A moment's thought will show that an increase in the electro-positive charge of the atmosphere must cause the zones to advance nearer to the equator; but a diminution to retire towards the poles. For their position is determined by the relative strength of two opposing forces, and will shift to and fro according as one or the other gets the advantage. So much, then, we can say—that auroræ are periodical because the zones of their developement are subject to oscillations; and that the zones oscillate because the intensity of atmospheric electricity fluctuates under solar influence. Here, indeed, we meet the difficulty of defining how that influence is exercised. A mere stimulation of the forces of terrestrial magnetism will not suffice; since the increase of power to induce tension would be met by an equivalent increase of power to resist neutralisation, the situation of which would consequently remain unchanged. And to invoke a direct flow of electricity from the sun would be to proceed on the *obscurum per obscurius* principle. We must needs await for the untying of this knot, the teaching of the future: *Zeit bringt Rath*.

It has been attempted to test the truth of the 'magneto-inductive' theory of polar lights by a study of thunderstorm statistics; but with little result. It is true that they are alternative modes of relief—that electricity which misses the one channel must traverse the other. The occurrence of a storm, in fact, might be compared to the opening of a sluice for the escape of some portion of the flood which must otherwise rush down the bed of the river; so that with an increase of the one class of phenomena the other might be expected to decline, and *vice versâ*. But what if the overflow be so considerable as to occupy simultaneously all available means of issue? Admit an *absolute* periodical increase in atmospheric electricity, and we might easily have, for auroræ and thunderstorms, not contrary, but parallel fluctuations. Hence, little importance can attach either to M. Fritz's negative result from a comparison of figures, or to Professor Piazzi Smyth's concluded inverse relation.

The connexion is then present, although too closely

entangled with perturbing circumstances to be of much use to our enquiries. Auroræ might, indeed, with some appropriateness, be called 'polar lightnings.' But without thunder? Have they no audible accompaniment, the attenuated representative of the fierce rattle of tropical disruptive discharges? The point is an interesting one, and has long been in dispute. The very fact of the controversy shows that the auroral voice, if it exist at all, is a 'still small voice' indeed. But let us see how the case stands.

Humboldt remarks, in his 'Cosmos,' that 'Northern lights' appear to have become less noisy since their occurrences have 'been more accurately recorded;' and the reproach that, like rapping spirits, they are silent in the presence of experts or unbelievers, has an air of plausibility. An overwhelming mass of scientific evidence is on the negative side. One expedition after another has wintered in the arctic regions, paying close attention to the subject, with the same result. Parry, Scoresby, Sabine, McClintock, Weyprecht, Norden-skiöld, Payer, Tromholt, domesticated, so to speak, for years with the aurora borealis, found it obstinately inaudible. Sir John Franklin's party registered 343 unheard auroræ on the shores of the Great Bear Lake in 1825-7; not a whisper reached the ears of MM. Lottin and Bravais from any of the splendid displays witnessed by them at Bossekop in 1838-9. Weyprecht, a model observer, describes the luminous apparitions seen from the ice-pack off Franz Josef's Land as 'often so vivid, that one listened, such a spectacle' appearing impossible without an attendant developement of 'sound. But, in spite of the utmost attention, we never 'succeeded in perceiving the note of the Northern lights.'* M. Tromholt, too, assures us that every one of the intense auroræ studied by him in various parts of the arctic regions was *perfectly silent*. Yet he was surrounded at Koutokaeino by implicit believers in the enigmatical sounds, while the natives of Bossekop told him 'they did not think there was 'any aurora borealis at all until it whizzed.'† 'Some 'acoustic deception or misunderstanding must,' he is driven to suppose, 'be at the bottom of this apparent glaring discrepancy between fact and conviction.'

It is, at any rate, sufficiently widespread. Dwellers in high latitudes everywhere affirm the reality of auroral sounds. We read in Gmelin's *Siberian Travels* :—

* Denkschriften kais. Akad. Wien, Bd. xxxv. p. 319.

† Under the Rays of the Aurora Borealis, vol. i. p. 285.

'These Northern lights begin with single bright pillars, rising to the north, and almost at the same time in the north-east, which, gradually increasing, comprehend a large space of the heavens, rush about from place to place with incredible velocity, and finally almost cover the whole sky up to the zenith. The streamers are then seen meeting together in the zenith, and produce an appearance as if a vast tent were expanded in the heavens, glittering with gold, rubies, and sapphire. A more beautiful spectacle cannot be painted; but whoever should see such a Northern light for the first time could not behold it without terror. For, however fine the illumination may be, it is attended, as I have learned from the relation of many persons, with such a hissing, crackling, and rushing noise throughout the air as if the largest fireworks were playing off. To describe what they then hear, they make use of the expression *Spolochi chodjat*, that is, the raging host is passing. The hunters who pursue the white and blue foxes in the confines of the Icy Sea are often overtaken in their course by these Northern lights. Their dogs are then so much frightened that they will not move, but lie obstinately on the ground till the noise has passed.' *

This, it is true, is told at second-hand, and is totally unconfirmed by the personal experience of any European traveller in Siberia. But evidence to a similar effect may be collected in abundance from Canadian trappers, Greenland whale-fishers, Esquimaux, Indians, Shetlanders, Norwegians. All aver that a crackling, rustling, or whizzing sound accompanies the darting movements of polar streamers. The ancient Scandinavians imagined that in this 'hissing eerie 'din' (as Burns calls it) they heard the far-off songs of the Valkyries; the Greenlanders attribute it to the struggles in the air of departed spirits; more prosaic, the Lapps compare it to the cracking of a reindeer's joints as it walks; while the Indians north of Hudson's Bay designate the aurora *Edthin* (reindeer cow), because it shares the crepitative quality of that animal's hide when it is rubbed, and gives off sparks.†

The incredulous to such popular impressions have found two ways of accounting for them. First, by the instinctive association of light and colour with tone, which has led to the illusion, amongst primitive peoples, of sunrise and sunset music. Tacitus connects the persuasion of the sun's sonorous emergence by the shores of the Baltic with their situation close to the verge of the world,‡ consequently within ear-shot of the celestial concert, described as follows in a strophe

* Quoted by Blagden, 'Phil. Trans.' vol. lxxiv. p. 228.

† Fritz, 'Das Polarlicht,' p. 287.

‡ Germania, cap. 45.

of Albrecht von Halberstadt's 'Titurel,' where the 'music of the spheres' has evidently edged itself into Western folklore:—

'Then in his orb the sun to whirling took,
I ween such glut of sweetness none might brook,
With dulcet din his orb he rolled,
That clang of strings or bird that sings were like as copper
beside gold.'*

More plausible is the explanation by the deceptive effect of a real sound, and one peculiar to frozen regions. Ice-fields have a weird voice of their own, at times clamorously audible, as of old to the Ancient Mariner:—

'The ice was here, the ice was there,
The ice was all around;
It cracked and growled, and roared and howled,
Like noises in a swound.'

Noises of the same kind, in all gradations, from a deafening crash to the faintest whisper, continually disturb the trance of an arctic winter. Two members of Sir John Franklin's party, Dr. Richardson and Lieutenant Hood, heard, during the progress of an aurora on March 11, 1821, sharp hissing sounds, which seemed to proceed from all parts of the sky, and often to arise simultaneously with the flashing of the streamers. But they were equally perceptible next morning, after the aurora had disappeared, and were explained by a person of experience as due to the contraction of the snow under a sudden increase of cold.† Such sounds are much more acute at sea than on land. Lieutenant Weyprecht tells us that the ice-fields are never really for a moment silent. Mutterings and grumbings are always to be heard if one listens closely enough for them. They are rendered intelligible by an inspection of the ice towards the end of the winter. Not a square foot of it is then found intact. It has been minutely split up in every conceivable direction, through the influence of constant changes of temperature.‡ Sharp hearing, combined with indistinct powers of reasoning and an impressionable fancy, might hence, it is contended, easily educe the disputed auroral sounds.

There is evidence, however, in their favour which cannot thus be disposed of. Halley's aurora of 1716 is the earliest to which the peculiarity was attributed on good authority.

* Grimm, 'Deutsche Mythologie,' p. 742 (Stallybrass's trans.).

† Sir J. Franklin's 'Narrative,' App. III. p. 628 (1823).

‡ Denkschriften, Wien, Bd. xxxv. p. 319.

E. J. Burman of Upsala, in a communication to the Royal Society, speaks of its 'whispering and whistling, like flames 'on a hearth.'* The same kind of impression was made upon Hearne, a traveller in the Hudson's Bay Territory in 1771 and some following years. 'I can positively affirm,' he said, 'that in still nights, I have frequently heard these meteors 'making a rustling and crackling noise, like the waving of a 'large flag in a fresh gale of wind.'† And Wrangel noticed, as it were, a faint breath of wind on a flame when the streamers formed very fast.‡ The coincidence of illustration in the following passage from Mrs. Butler's (Fanny Kemble's) 'Record of a Girlhood' gives a strong stamp of reality to the experience related in it.

'Standing on that balcony,' she writes, 'late one cold, clear night' (at Edinburgh about 1829), 'I saw for the first time the sky illuminated with the aurora borealis. It was a magnificent display of the phenomenon, and I feel certain that my attention was first attracted to it by the crackling sound which appeared to accompany the motion of the pale flames as they streamed across the sky; indeed, *crackling* is not the word that properly describes the sound I heard, which was precisely that made by the *flickering* of blazing fire; and as I have often since read and heard discussions upon the question whether the motion of the aurora is or is not accompanied by an audible sound, I can only say that on this occasion it was the sound that first induced me to observe the sheets of white light that were leaping up the sky.' §

One aurora, and (we believe) one only, has been *heard* so far south as Paris. The fact was attested by two scientific auditors, M. Charles and Messier the astronomer. On May 21, 1762, the latter observed from the Observatoire de la Marine, a display of polar lights which entered at 11 P.M. on a new and striking phase. Brilliant white flashes began chasing each other in rapid succession from the north to the west, up to an apparent height of twenty degrees from the horizon. Their direction was thus at right angles to that of ordinary streamers. It was these 'coups de lumière,' as Messier calls them, which were found to be audible. We give his words as he wrote them:—

'Ce que j'observais encore de remarquable et de singulier, c'est que dans les temps que ces lumières quittaient l'horizon, j'entendais une espèce de murmure, sombre à la vérité, mais cependant à ne pas s'y

* Phil. Trans., vol. xxxiii. p. 175.

† Edin. Journ. of Science, vol. vi. p. 348.

‡ Kämtz, 'Lehrbuch der Meteorologie,' Bd. iii. p. 480.

§ Vol. i. p. 236. Mr. Parkhurst drew attention to the passage in 'Nature,' vol. xxiii. p. 484.

méprendre; la tranquillité dans laquelle j'étais, et l'attention que j'apportais après le premier soupçon que j'en eus, ne me laissèrent point douter par la suite que le bruit que j'entendais ne parvînt du commencement de l'éclair, et je ne peux mieux comparer le bruit qu'à celui qui est produit par l'effet de l'électricité.*

This is very remarkable at a time when the electrical origin of auroræ had barely been suggested; nor is it likely that Messier had taken any heed of Canton's conjecture nine years previously. There is, however, an obvious difficulty in associating the flashes above described with the sounds that appeared to attend them. And the same difficulty is encountered in all narratives of auroral audibility. It is that they were simultaneously perceived. But sound travels only 1,100 *feet*, light nearly 187,000 *miles* a second; so that audible and visible manifestations of the same phenomenon—such as thunder and lightning—separate very rapidly as they travel. Now the aurora witnessed by Messier was without doubt greatly more distant than any thunderstorm; hence it is quite certain that what he saw and what he heard did not originate in the same spot. The sounds, if real (as there is every reason to suppose they were) must have been secondary effects, instantaneously produced close at hand. This would also help to explain the great rarity and localised character of such instances.

Nevertheless, we meet with them from time to time even in temperate regions. Sir David Brewster heard a 'whizzing noise' from the brilliant aurora of December 5, 1801, 'exactly similar to the sound which accompanies the passage of an electric spark from the glass cylinder to the conductor.'† Hansteen was able to recall the impression made upon him when he was ten years old by 'a quick whispering sound simultaneously with the motion of the rays over his head.'‡ Parrot heard something the same at Dorpat in 1804; and Theodor Brorsen the astronomer at Flensburg about 1857, when the sound was so striking and so obviously associated with auroral coruscations, that no one, he asserted, could reasonably doubt the connexion.§ The most recent communication on the subject comes from the far north, and through the most authentic channel. Captain Dawson, chief of the British Polar Expedition at Fort Rae in 1882–3,

* *Mémoires présentés par divers Savants*, t. vi. p. 111.

† *Edin. Journ. of Science*, vol. v. p. 75.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 76.

§ *Wochenschrift für Astronomie*, Bd. ii. p. 172.

whose observations have been printed by the Royal Society under the title quoted at the head of this article, writes:—

‘The displays were as a rule unattended by the slightest sound, but that a peculiar and distinct sound does occasionally accompany certain displays of aurora, there can be no doubt. The Indians, and voyageurs of the Hudson’s Bay Company, who often pass their nights in the open, say that it is not uncommon; a European who lives in a house may pass a lifetime in the country without hearing it. On one occasion I was fortunate enough to hear it myself. The sound was like the swishing of a whip, or the noise produced by a sharp squall of wind in the upper rigging of a ship; and as the aurora brightened and faded, so did the sound which accompanied it. This proves that the aurora could not have been distant, and I think it possible that these low auroræ may be of a different nature to the high ones’ (p. 253).

This is just what was wanted—a genuine piece of scientific evidence. It confers upon the problematical sounds, so to speak, official rank. The belief in their reality is no longer an outcast opinion, begging here and there for scraps of corroboration, but may claim admittance to the grave halls of recognised knowledge.

A curious incident, bearing upon this subject, occurred during the Franco-Prussian War. M. Rolier, a practised aéronaut and emissary of the Government of Defence, left Paris in a balloon November 24, 1870. Fourteen hours later he made aerial shipwreck on the coast of Norway, in 59° north latitude. In the course of his descent, he found himself, at a height from the ground of about 4,000 mètres, enveloped for a considerable time in a cloud of vast extent and peculiar character. A sulphurous odour of suffocating quality proceeded from it, accompanied by a light scratching or rustling noise, like that of a steel pen travelling over a polished surface. The sound and the smell ceased together, and the adventurous stranger witnessed from *terra firma*, the same evening, a splendid aurora borealis.* The sound he afterwards identified with that produced by an electric discharge at low tension, and the smell with that of ozone. Now ozone, or condensed oxygen (to define it in two words), is always developed when that element is subjected to the action of electricity, and there is reason to believe that the atmospheric supply is increased when auroræ are frequent. An auroral *smell* has even been noticed by some persons, and was likened by Bergman to that of sulphur.† We may, then,

* Mém. de l’Acad. des Sciences, t. xxxviii. p. 471.

† L’Astronomie, Mars 1886, p. 96.

safely say that M. Rolier passed through a cloud in which an electrical discharge of an auroral nature was proceeding.

This raises the interesting but obscure question of the relation of clouds to auroræ. There is no doubt that it is an intimate one. Sir John Franklin frequently saw the arches and streamers of the previous night mimicked during the daytime in the white fleeces of cumuli. Lieutenant Weyprecht observed the imitation to apply not only to shape but to movement, and he evidently believes that so-called 'daylight auroræ' are all of this spurious description.* It has often been noticed that the fitting of polar streamers across the moon evoked an instantaneous halo of the ordinary kind, due to the refractive effect of ice-spicules high up in the air; and in the course of auroral exhibitions all the more characteristic cloud-formations are at times developed in bewildering and inexplicable transformations.

With one class, however, the relationship is especially close. The cloud-fabric known as 'cirrus,' daintily woven out of frozen water-vapour at an elevation of some 30,000 feet, is not only found in constant companionship with auroræ, so as frequently to precede, and almost invariably to survive, their appearance, but two peculiarities common to both prove their connexion to be a fundamental one. The parallel ranks of the cirrus, stretching in apparently convergent lines from one horizon to the other, escape the compulsion of the winds only to fall under the sway of a more subtle force. Humboldt noted the tendency of this species of cloud in all parts of the world to follow the line of the magnetic meridian—that is, to adopt the magnetic pole for their point of convergence—and hence named them *bandes polaires*. A position at right angles to the above at other times equally betrays their polarity. In the first case, their analogy is with auroral streamers; in the second, with auroral arcs. Stranger still, cirrus, as well as solar and lunar halos, obey the same laws of periodicity with auroræ, exhibiting strong maxima at the equinoxes, and becoming rare or frequent *pari passu* with sunspots.

It is certain, nevertheless, that, as a rule, auroral and cloud-phenomena occur in widely different regions of the atmosphere. True, the heights of auroræ have been estimated with such bewildering and extravagant variety that, at first sight, it might well seem impossible to arrive at anything like a satisfactory conclusion on the subject. By accident of

* Denkschriften, Wien, Bd. xxxv. p. 308.

observation or caprice of theory they have been now elevated to above a thousand miles from the earth's surface, now depressed almost into contact with it. Yet some well-ascertained facts emerge clearly from the confusion. To these we shall endeavour to adhere.

The arch is the only ordinary feature of an aurora of which any trustworthy measures for distance can be obtained. And even these are liable to be invalidated as well by the capricious movements of the object they are executed upon, as by its complex laminated structure. With due precautions, however, unexceptionable results can be, and have frequently been, derived from the ordinary parallax method. That is to say, the height of an aurora can be determined just like the distance of the moon, by observing its apparent displacement as viewed from different parts of the globe. Only that, in the case of the aurora, the 'base-line,' as it is called, is necessarily very much shorter. Instead of posting one observer at Greenwich and the other at the Cape of Good Hope, we must be satisfied with converging lines of sight, say from Edinburgh and Manchester, or from London and York.

Repeated observations of this kind have placed it beyond doubt that, *in these latitudes*, auroræ uniformly occur within the assigned limits, indeed, of the atmosphere, but in air of which the excessive tenuity rivals, or exceeds, that attained in the best laboratory vacua. John Dalton, who gave the first results in this matter worthy of serious attention, computed an aurora, widely visible in 1794, to be about 150; one in 1826, 100 miles from the earth's surface. Professor Challis, combining his Cambridge observations with those of Mr. Chevallier at Durham, placed the arch of March 19, 1847, at a height of 177 miles. Repeated measurements of the zenithal arches not uncommon in Scotland and the north of England, but rare further south, prove that their elevation is between seventy and seventy-four miles; and the risk of error in these exceptionally favourable cases does not extend, according to Mr. Plummer, beyond a couple of miles.* At an average height of seventy miles, too, M. Tromholt's careful determinations located the numerous auroræ observed by him in Lapland in 1882-3, although individual results varied from 47 to 164 miles.

The general truth of these conclusions has been confirmed by modes of measurement independent of parallax. Professor Newton, of Yale College, published in 1865 † a plan

* Nature, vol. xxii. p. 362.

† Amer. Journ. of Science, vol. xxxix. p. 286.

for calculating the height of an arch, based on the very probable supposition that it is an illuminated portion of a real ring, parallel with the earth's surface and symmetrical with the magnetic pole. No second observation at a distance is required. The computation, on these principles, of twenty-eight arches, gave an average elevation of 134 miles. Professor Fearnley of Christiania deduced by the same method 125 miles.

Less reliance can be placed on the system of Professor J. G. Galle of Breslau, according to which the height of an auroral corona is deduced from its deviation to the south of the magnetic zenith. By one set of measures, he thus found for the great aurora of February 4, 1872, an altitude of 258, by another, of 276 miles.* The validity of the method has been impeached, but the result is interesting as the first attempt to locate in space the terminus of a set of streamers.

But these great heights are far from being invariably maintained nearer the pole. There, undoubtedly, auroræ descend at times to the ordinary cloud-level. Convincing evidence of the fact is provided by the observations of M. Paulsen, Chief of the Danish Meteorological Station at Godthaab, in 1882-3. Godthaab, it may be observed, is situated just on the northern border of the great auroral zone, in latitude $64^{\circ} 10'$. Here the heights of thirty-two arches were determined by simultaneous observations from posts a little less than six kilometres apart. Ten proved so distant that only a lower limit of 68 kilometres could be assigned to them. The twenty-two others ranged downwards from that level to 1350 and 600 metres. These two last actually spanned the fiord between the observers, to one appearing projected upon the northern, to the other upon the southern sky. Their aspect was that of curtains in large folds, or bunches of streamers lying close together. M. Paulsen is hence fully justified in his conclusion that, while some arctic auroræ lie at the same vast heights as in temperate regions, others are of a purely local character.†

Some of the many reports, indeed, of clouds lit from below by auroral light, and of auroral gleams playing across the face of cliffs and even between the walking-sticks of pedestrians, rest on illusory impressions; others do not properly apply to auroræ. What we understand by an aurora borealis is not a mere mass of luminous *protoplasts*,

* Astron. Nachr., No. 1877.

† Nature, vol. xxix. p. 337.

but an organised luminous *structure*. Phosphorescent mists of an auroral nature may often be met straying down to the very sea-level; they provide, it is true, the physical basis of the phenomenon, but they should be carefully distinguished from the phenomenon itself. Atmospheric developments of light are of indefinitely varied character and intensity. In high latitudes especially, where a continuous slow electric discharge from sky to earth is probably always going on, it cannot be wondered at if casual gleams occasionally betray its progress. We are told, indeed, that arctic nights are never wholly dark—that some degree of atmospheric illumination always shimmers along those ice-bound coasts. And, even in temperate climates, self-luminous clouds are much more common than is generally supposed.

A rare opportunity for determining the height of an aurora occurred November 17, 1882, and was happily not thrown away. Throughout that month magnetic disturbances were rife, and were obviously related to the appearance on the sun of the largest spot-group ever registered at Greenwich. At about 6 P.M. on the 17th (Mr. Rand Capron tells us),* while an aurora was fitfully blazing towards the north, English observers were startled by the emergence of

‘a long beam of detached bright light which, apparently lengthening as it advanced, crossed rapidly the southern horizon in front of, or near, the moon, and then sank in the west, shortening in length as it did so. The light emitted from it was described by one observer as of a glowing pearly white; and the general effect of this huge shining mass, sailing majestically across the sky, even to those accustomed to kindred phenomena, was at least one of wonder and surprise, while in the less experienced in such matters it created a feeling of absolute awe.’

The shape of this Titan’s bolt was very much that of a torpedo; its length fell little short of a third of an entire quadrant of the heavens; its breadth equalled seven lunar diameters. The fortunate vicinity of the moon to its track gave peculiar facilities for fixing its position, and so arriving at a tolerably accurate knowledge of its real altitude. This came out, from the separate calculations of Professor A. S. Herschel and Mr. Rand Capron, based upon observations made in the Low Countries as well as in England, almost exactly 133 miles. Hence, its visible flight having occupied about a minute and a quarter, a velocity was deduced for it of ten miles a second; while in actual extent it covered at

* Phil. Mag., vol. xv. p. 319.

least sixty miles. That it was an integral part of the aurora it accompanied, and no casual group of passing meteors (as was at first maintained), appeared from several circumstances. It travelled from magnetic east to west; it was translucent (which meteors are not), stars having been observed to shine through it; it emitted, as the spectroscope showed, characteristic auroral light. Moreover, analogous apparitions have been recorded during earlier displays of Northern lights. Halley described in 1716 a beam of 'a great pyramidal figure,' which was carried 'with an equable, and not very slow, motion, from the north-east where it arose, into the north-west where it disappeared; . . . and, passing successively over all the stars of the Little Bear, did not efface the smaller ones in the Tail, which are but of the fifth magnitude, such was the extreme rarity and perspicuity of the matter whereof it consisted.' The ease with which its height could have been determined by distant simultaneous observations at once struck him; but chance gave him no co-operator.*

The aurora of January 7, 1831, was attended by a similar appearance. Thus, the 'beam' observed in 1882 seems to have belonged to a *class* of auroral phenomena. Nor was it without a solar analogue. On the minute terrestrial scale it reproduced most strikingly the extraordinary photospheric outburst witnessed by Carrington and Hodgson, September 1, 1859. The sun, it is true, showed a pair of moving bodies; their light was almost infinitely more intense than that of the auroral beam; their rate of travel about a dozen times as swift. Otherwise, their transit accurately imaged its career. Each apparition, besides, was symptomatic of widespread magnetic disturbance. The solar display was instantly responded to on the earth by magnificent auroræ, agitated magnetic instruments, and tumultuous earth currents. It belonged, in short, to a phase of solar excitement strictly corresponding with the magnetic storm in the midst of which the 'torpedo beam' of November 17, 1882, effected its stately and surprising passage across our skies.

Its measured height, however, of 133 miles encounters an experimental difficulty. The power of air to conduct electricity increases, as we have seen, with its rarity; but only up to a certain point. As exhaustion proceeds, the passage of a current is rendered more and more difficult, until a stage is reached where, with any means available in the labora-

* Phil. Trans., vol. xxix. p. 412.

tory, it becomes impossible. Even the powerful current generated by Mr. Warren de la Rue's magnificent chloride of silver battery of 11,000 cells was stopped by a vacuum corresponding to a height in our atmosphere of eighty-one miles; and he concluded 124 miles to be a limit at which no electric discharge could occur under any circumstances not utterly improbable.*

This looks serious for the electrical theory of the aurora borealis; but we are reassured on turning to the researches of M. Edlund. For they lend much countenance to the belief that the obstacle to transmission resides, not in the vacuum, but in the electrodes, and that the current, if introduced without their aid, would readily traverse a vessel at the highest possible stage of exhaustion.† Thus, since electrodes are a purely artificial contrivance, we are set free from any trammels of this kind as to the position of auroræ. Indeed, the free transmission of electricity through interplanetary space is rendered at least theoretically possible.

The luminous effects and changes of colour in Mr. de la Rue's experiments on electrical discharges were of great beauty and interest. Irresistibly, by their striking resemblance to auroral displays, they suggested a community of origin. The light in his tubes was found to be most brilliant at a rarefaction corresponding to a height in the atmosphere of thirty-eight miles; in lower vacua, salmon tints and rich carmine glows were produced; in higher, the luminosity became wan and feeble. In correspondence with these results is the fact that the red hues of prismatic auroræ show a decided tendency to take a lower place, and may hence be assumed to develope in denser air than the green. On the other hand, the low-lying auroræ of arctic lands are generally colourless; while the flaming kind, which have at times thrown kingdoms into consternation, assuredly occur at great elevations. They are, as a rule, widely visible; they belong characteristically to middle latitudes, and are of extreme rarity further north; they are, besides, specially associated with solar disturbance, and with the sympathetic general excitement of the forces of terrestrial magnetism.

In one important respect Mr. de la Rue's illuminated vacua deviated from the auroral pattern. The light emitted from them was of a totally different quality.

The spectrum of the aurora is a very peculiar one. It

* *Proc. Roy. Soc.*, vol. xxx. p. 332.

† *Phil. Mag.*, vol. xv. p. 1 (5th series).

might have been expected to prove analogous to that of lightning—to contain, that is, the characteristic rays of atmospheric air rendered incandescent by electricity. But neither oxygen, nitrogen, hydrogen, nor carbon appears to have anything to do with it. None of these substances, at least, in any hitherto known form, give light identifiable with that derived from the polar arch and streamers. Examined with the spectroscope, these show one principal and invariable bright line, named by the Astronomer-Royal for Scotland, from its yellow colour tinged with green, the ‘citron line.’ Six or seven other lines, notably one in the red, have been measured, though not identified; but the citron line is the essential constituent of auroral light. It is never absent, and in high latitudes usually appears alone. It is, besides, singularly diffusive and persistent. Sometimes its presence reveals a latent aurora; and while a display is progressing it often seems to come from all parts of the sky, and even, by reflection, from terrestrial objects. The substance emitting it is thus certainly present wherever polar lights show; yet the nature of that substance is entirely unknown. No spectrum ever yet obtained in a laboratory includes it. A supposed agreement with a ray from the zodiacal light gave room for tempting speculations, but it turned out that Angström, and one or two other observers, had been misled by the presence of diffused auroræ, and had only succeeded in identifying the citron line with itself. An attempt to establish an analogy between the original radiance of the sun’s corona and auroral light promptly collapsed; vacuum-tubes, and electric ‘glows’ and ‘brushes’ of all kinds and qualities were tried equally in vain, and to fall back upon ‘phosphorescence’ was only to seek a veil for total ignorance. At last, however, came the news that the aurora, citron line and all, had been artificially produced.

Professor Selim Lemström, of the Helsingfors University, observed many years ago, amongst the innumerable varieties of atmospheric luminous effects in polar regions, one which inspired him with particular interest, as likely to afford a clue to the origin of the aurora borealis.* It consisted in the appearance of a feeble flare round the tops of mountains or other elevated objects. This he conceived the possibility of intensifying, if not of inducing, and made some practical advances towards the realisation of the idea in Lapland in 1871. As head of the Finnish meteorological station at

* Bulletin de la Commission Polaire, livr. iv. p. 125.

Sodankylä, in 1882-3, he had, however, better opportunities.

Above a dozen miles from the village a desolate mountain called Orantunturi rises a thousand feet above the enviroining forest-clad plain. This was made the scene of a colossal experiment. An insulated network of copper wire, fitted at every half-mètre with fine, erected, iron points, was laid on telegraph poles over nearly 3,000 square feet of its summit. The inner end of the spiral was then led, carefully covered and protected, to the base of the mountain, and there connected, first with a galvanometer, finally with a zinc plate buried in the earth. This 'discharging apparatus' was completed December 5, 1882. Like Franklin's kite, it served the Promethean purpose of bringing down fire from heaven, albeit in a mild and harmless form. For at night, even when all other heights were dark, it was surmounted by a restless halo of yellowish-white light, which we must call 'auroral,' since it yielded to the spectroscope the distinctive citron line, while the galvanometer registered, in perfect accordance with Edlund's theory, a current of positive electricity setting in from the mountain towards the earth.

The accumulation of hoar-frost upon the wires, by destroying their insulation, soon put a stop to observations which a temperature of 30° Centigrade below zero rendered difficult and painful. They were soon afterwards renewed on another mountain farther north, with success marked and varied by the substitution of a straight beam standing erect over the apparatus for the diffused glow which had previously encircled it.

The spectrum of the aurora has, then, been produced even if it cannot be explained. It is obvious, however, that it is not derived from an element foreign to chemical science, but from a modification, through electrical action, of some known substance—most likely oxygen or nitrogen.

The extremely scant proportion of highly refrangible rays in auroral light accounts for its feeble photographic power. Attempts to secure an impression, even with the highly sensitive dry plates now in use, uniformly failed until M. Tromholt at Christiania, in May 1885, obtained, by means of an exposure of eight and a half minutes, a trace of chemical action too faint to bear printing from the negative. Indeed, the entire luminous power of an aurora borealis is small compared with the magnificence of some of its effects. An ordinarily bright one gives out about as much light as the moon in its first quarter; and only the most vivid auroræ

equal the lustre of full moonlight. During his year at Fort Rae, Captain Dawson observed one display bright enough to read by (September 22, 1882); but a large proportion of the arches, streaks, and patches recorded by him barely outshone the Milky Way. Nor has the intensest auroral light power to efface stars of the higher magnitudes.

To sum up. The polar aurora may be described with confidence as a light-process incidental to the electrical circulation of our globe, or as a gradual and innocuous form of lightning. The wide-spreading radiance of its displays is due to the extreme tenuity of the medium in which they occur; the luminous lines of its architecture are laid down by the rule and compass of terrestrial magnetism. There are, indeed, many subordinate varieties of atmospheric illumination, common especially within the arctic zone, which partake of the nature while devoid of the structural peculiarities of the aurora. These are difficult to classify. They are certainly of electrical origin, and the same modification of matter as in the most perfect exhibition of polar streamers is set vibrating to produce their light. The main difference seems to be that they have their seat in comparatively dense air near the earth's surface, and are (perhaps for that reason) exempt from the directive influence of its magnetism, while vague and casual in their luminous effects. M. Lemström exhibited at South Kensington in 1876 a 'polar-light apparatus,' showing that electric currents which traverse invisibly air at ordinary pressure no sooner encounter rarefied strata than they kindle them into vivid radiance. In the same way, most probably, the continuation to the earth of the currents evoking auroral streamers in the tenuous upper atmosphere remains ordinarily obscure and unseen, but occasionally gives rise to the anomalous effects of light which have caused so much perplexity to students of the aurora borealis.

The wider significance, meanwhile, of the phenomenon must not be overlooked. This was often, in past times, suspected and groped after, but has only of late been brought fully home to the minds of enquirers. The 'silver-streak' view, indeed, is now not more completely discredited in international politics than in cosmical physics. We no longer ignore, wrapped in our 'cloud of all-sustaining air,' the variety and extent of our relations with the great world beyond. Some of these, it is true, are imperfectly understood. It is easy to see whence we derive the benefits of light and warmth and orbital guidance. But there are other modes of action

from without, less obvious, yet perhaps not less essential to our continued well-being. In some unknown manner, solar energy unquestionably reacts upon the electrical and magnetic condition of our planet, by turns stimulating and relaxing its activity in correspondence with its own rhythmical alternations. Such correspondence is part of the vital union which subsists between the various members of our system. No one of them is truly independent of the others. They form together, as it were, a living and co-operative whole. Polar lights are as a beacon kindled in response to the subtle messengers of the sun, telling that the earth is no dead or cast-off member, but still thrills in harmony with, as well as moves obediently to, the great life-sustaining luminary.

ART. V.—1. *Miscellaneous Works of Philip Stanhope, Earl of Chesterfield*. 3 vols. 8vo. London: 1779.

2. *A Tour in Ireland*. By ARTHUR YOUNG. 2 vols. 8vo. Dublin: 1780.

3. *Memoir of Thomas Drummond*. By JOHN F. MACLENNAN. London: 1875.

MR. LECKY, who has himself given us an interesting sketch of the subject in his 'History of England in the 'Eighteenth Century,' justly remarks that 'Irish history has 'passed to a lamentable extent into the hands of religious 'polemics, of dishonest partisans, and of half-educated and 'uncritical enthusiasts.' He might have used stronger adjectives and sharper invectives. It is a disgrace to our literature that the materials, which are now fairly abundant, should not by this time have been woven by some practised and trustworthy writer into a readable history, conceived in a spirit of absolute impartiality, and available at the present crisis for the formation of opinion. The history of England itself is of comparatively little moment at the present stage of our national life; the country wants to know what it has done with Ireland during the seven centuries of its dominion, especially what it has done since the expulsion of King James the Second from Irish soil, and during the present century. Even the shallowest politician is aware that the future for which he is now summoned to provide must necessarily be the offspring of the past. If ever there was a demand for the 'eye of experience' it is now. The most brilliant statesman, the most inventive constitution-monger is no more to be trusted than a child unless he has

thoroughly mastered all the details of Irish history and grasped their full significance; nor unless we have each of us in our measure acquired some such knowledge, can we escape the ignominy of rendering a blind obedience, very unworthy of Englishmen, to political leaders.

One phenomenon must strike any person—who has even skimmed the pages of such histories and sketches of Irish history as exist. Whoever and whatever else is right, the English Government is always wrong. Roman Catholic or Protestant, 'Nationalist' or 'brutally English,' the writer feels he cannot be wrong if he attributes the failures which have occurred to the follies and vices of the English system, and that he cannot be right if he allows his reader to suppose that there ever was a time when Ireland was well governed and her people anything but miserable. If facts of an opposite kind are obstinate, they are of no avail—for what is the use of picking out two or three doubtful exceptions?—or, if they cannot be tossed aside, they are made to lend additional force to the argument. Have the 'downtrodden' people appeared to give evidence of contentment or prosperity? What could you expect from men out of whom all spirit had been crushed? It only proves that the iron had entered into their very soul. Even the slaves on the Middle Passage were said to be enjoying happy dances on deck when they were only leaping up and down in fetters under the lash of the owner, in order that they might keep life together a little longer. Enough! It is impossible to deal with perverse and uncandid interpretations of history. Let us submit one or two considerations to the reader.

Have not these critics of the English Government a little too much lost sight of the fact that the larger island has during the last ages been only slowly passing into her present stage of enlightenment? Was she herself governed upon principles much superior to those which she introduced into the government of Ireland? Could she be expected to do more for her than for herself? And secondly, when a cheap and virtuous indignation is poured forth with so much unction upon the government of Ireland under the Penal Laws, is sufficient allowance made for the fact that the ramification of Jacobite intrigue in France and Spain, as well as England and Ireland, was necessarily the main factor in the English policy of the first half of the eighteenth century? We might suppose, if we listened to some, that the danger of a Stuart reaction had passed away with the Battle of the Boyne, whereas the earlier Hanoverian kings and their

ministers were never free from the dread of an impending catastrophe. What we have to do then—it ought not to be necessary to say so—is to learn to regard the modern history of Ireland not abstractedly, but relatively; and the way in which it was governed not as the thing which might have been had man never been expelled from Paradise, but as it existed under certain circumstances and after a particular past history. A few words on the Ireland which the House of Hanover found at its arrival on English shores must precede the estimate which we propose to make of the sort of government which existed in that island during a large part of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The mediæval history of Ireland, the Reformation period, that of the Stuarts and Cromwell, even the ‘pious and immortal’ memory of William and the brilliant reign of Anne will find no place here; not even the Treaty of Limerick and the endless discussion as to the conduct of the conquerors in dealing with its provisions. We cannot undo the past; we may take warning by it. Those who attempt to roll back the stream of time are engaged in the frivolous task of Sisypus.

To measure the responsibilities of the nation when it imposed the Penal Laws of Queen Anne’s reign, common fairness requires that we should take into account that they were framed during a state of war, under the memory of the recent Irish struggle in which England had only just held her own, under the pressure of the enormous taxation required to hurl back the legions of Louis XIV., James Stuart’s master and patron, and when it had become necessary to bridle the hostility of Scotland by means of a ‘union’ effected in much the same manner as in Ireland a century later. Gladly would the wise ministers of Anne have adopted that expedient in the sister island at the same time; but the circumstances of the two smaller kingdoms were wholly different. The machinery which alone in Ireland presented itself to them was that afforded by the Protestant landlords and the Church of Ireland. Power was to be reposed in their hands; the Roman Catholic estates were to be gradually broken up by a ‘Gavel Act;’ every inducement was to be held out to the Roman Catholics to change their religion. If our modern civilisation has taught us to shudder at these ideas, let us not forget what had made them seem not only expedient but right to the men of that age—what has forced the impartial Ranke to defend the sanguinary policy of Elizabeth, the tolerant Locke to find

an exception to his theory, the eloquent Jeremy Taylor, pleading for 'Liberty of Prophesying,' to acknowledge that there were limits beyond which even he could not proceed.

The root of bitterness strikes right down through the soil of the Middle Ages. The claim of the Papacy to hold the secular sword, to array the kings of the earth against one another in its service, and persecute to the death all who refused allegiance to the Vatican, produced its effects long after the Reformation, and has indeed only retired from observation by stress of adverse circumstances. As long as these principles were openly avowed and acted upon, the Reformed communions not unnaturally felt that the holders of them must be restrained and debilitated in order that they might not subvert society. If no faith was to be kept with heretics, then the holders of that opinion must not be allowed to assume a place which would enable them to give effect to it. If we are to measure degrees of blameableness, one wrong must be set off against the other. The conscientiousness with which, to the point of misery and death, the Papal theory was so often held, may excite our admiration; but the exercise of conscience has its limits, as modern society pronounces pretty frequently in our own day. When conscientious obligations make people 'hate one another for the love of God,' it is time for the policeman to step in.

At any rate, under the 'Protestant ascendancy' Ireland was at least retained in connexion with Great Britain during the critical period of the great war, and this was the system which the House of Hanover found in operation when the voice of Great Britain called it to the throne. If the new dynasty had desired ever so much to commence its rule under a better system, the Rebellion of 1715 settled the question in the negative. Ireland was too securely governed at the moment to admit of its taking any part with the Pretender; but who at that time could dream of superseding the machinery under which such a result had come about? Who could blame George I. and his advisers if, finding a large section of the Tories inextricably mixed up with the interests of the fallen dynasty and making common cause with the Roman Catholics for that purpose, they decided to govern England and Scotland through the agency of the Whigs, Ireland through that of the 'Protestant ascendancy'? Great Britain approved. Speaking by the mouth of her Parliament and the mass of the governing classes, she showed that, little as she loved the new-comers, she feared the return of the old House far more. The memory of the first Queen

Mary and the second King James was burnt into the soul of the English and Scotch people. That deep and indelible impression will account for many more things than can be noticed here.

The period of rest and tranquillity which Ireland experienced after the establishment of the Protestant ascendancy is reckoned by different writers at fifty, sixty, or ninety years; some going back to William's conquest of the Roman Catholic malcontents and their French allies, some to the commencement of Walpole's premiership; but all agree in closing the period with the outbreak of the war between Great Britain and her colonies. 'For fifty years,' says Mr. Froude, 'Ireland has no history.' This is very convenient for the historian, but it is at least equally suggestive to the political philosopher. Mr. Lecky accounts for the phenomenon by the engrossing occupation of the people in the supply of their material wants, and by the absence of the fighting part of the population in the military service of France and Spain. We cannot refuse to recognise the force of these reasons, but they are wholly inadequate. We must rather look to the growth of a moderate Roman Catholic party and the policy of playing them off against the Protestants; to the further policy which began to obtain of relaxing (without abrogating) the Penal Laws; finally, to the spirit of good will which was the result of these things on the part of the Roman Catholics, and which found its most remarkable expression under the influence of Lord Chesterfield, both as Lord Lieutenant and afterwards. All this is perfectly well known to students, but does not find sufficient notice in books. The struggle against the Jesuits which was proceeding in Europe towards the latter end of the period now before us was only the outcome of a long previously growing sentiment within the Roman Church. As education advanced, intelligent Roman Catholics had begun to see the error of the position into which the Popes and the Jesuits had led them, and, having got the worst of it in many a conflict with the State, were glad to establish a *modus vivendi*. There had always been a certain number of loyal Roman Catholics in Ireland, as the famous 'Loyal Remonstrance' proved; it was now largely increased.

Further, we must distinguish the half-century of Hanoverian government, during which the Penal Laws were deliberately relaxed, from the earlier period when they were far more generally, but not always, enforced. We connect this systematic relaxation with the policy of Walpole,

rather because he represented the system of *quieta non movere* which obtained in both islands for so long a period, than because we can trace it directly to his initiation. It was a general policy which penetrated into all departments of the State. By far the greatest minister of his age, he understood exactly what Great Britain, and indeed Europe, required after the stormy times of Louis XIV., William, and Anne. It was to be let alone. The triumphs of one party over another were to be abolished; men of opposite politics and religion were to learn to live together and occupy themselves in commerce and general improvement. It was no time for changing laws. Let those remain for future generations to deal with. They should hold their place on the statute-book, but should be practically inoperative.

This system may excite the contempt of the present age. It was open to gross abuse—and it was abused. It was indefensible on abstract principle. It was far from heroic or high-minded. But if it was as much as the country would bear, if to have attempted more would have ruined all, if it produced order and tranquillity for two generations—what are we to say? Why, simply this. Those generations knew pretty well their own interests; and it is very easy to lower high-stepping criticism down to the level of a puling pedantry. The evils were felt in England quite as much as in Ireland. The Church suffered not a little, religion suffered, the tone of society suffered, the national honour suffered. Walpole carried his system too far and too long. When that became clear the nation reared itself up and flung him off. Chatham's noble figure arose upon the scene of degradation, and under him the people learnt to put to a glorious use the strength which Walpole had taught them laboriously to acquire.

Along with this systematic relaxation of penal laws proceeded another systematic policy still less defensible on the ground of straightforwardness, but, in the absence of available force to carry matters with a high hand, effective in producing peace. The Irish Parliaments of Protestant landlords cherished the old traditions of the great struggle. Now the Roman Catholics were down—down they should be kept; their property was always a temptation, and the law was on the side of Parliament. The English Government threw its weight into the opposite scale. It took the side of the oppressed, who thus learnt to look upon it as their protector and, in spite of themselves, to admit feelings of loyalty to the Crown. The Irish Church also, influenced

by the discreditable feeling of a dislike to Dissenters superior to its dislike of the Roman Catholics, worked more or less with the English Government. Thus the humbled objects of the Penal Laws, often to their surprise, found themselves bidden to hold up their heads; and if there was no very cordial feeling between parties, there grew up a sentiment of contentment with their lot on all sides which in all probability, if the American War had not broken out, would soon have made the trade of the agitator impossible. But England had not yet learnt her lesson, and it took a second half-century to teach it. On the one hand she had not learnt the lesson of unselfish fairness in commercial matters. The vast burst of trading energy which issued in the formation of the empire, and the wars by which that empire was defended, was accompanied by a petty jealousy of Irish progress which brought its own punishment. Nor, on the other hand, amidst the imperial cares and ignominious political struggles of the early part of the reign of George III., was it possible for any such advanced statesmanship to prevail as might have swept away the Penal Laws, though the Jacobitism against which they had been framed had passed to its grave unnoticed during the Seven Years' War. It is not so easy for the immediate players to see when the game is won; for the umpire, the genius of history, cannot plant himself upon the field till it is over.

That this half-century of 'no history' did really partake of the character above assigned to it is evidenced by several considerations which have been too lightly passed over at the hands of our instructors. The strangeness of the fact that Ireland, the last refuge of the dethroned King, alone of the three kingdoms, remained unmoved by the Rebellion of 1745 has of course been noticed, but it is supposed to be quite accounted for by the previous Disarming Act; or, if the 'brilliant' Viceroyalty of Lord Chesterfield is mentioned, it is only to remark briefly on the exceptional character of the phenomenon. If Arthur Young's tour is cited, it is used for little else than to extract his testimony to the degraded position of the Roman Catholic population. In point of fact, all three of these things—and much more might be added—not only bear witness to the rapidly improving condition of Ireland in every respect, but are typical of a normal state of successful government.

The Rebellion of 1745 may be taken in this article along with Chesterfield's administration, since he was sent over from England for the express purpose of guiding Ireland

through the crisis. Young's tour occurring at the end of the period, may sum up the advance which had been made, while it ushers in the disastrous time which was about to follow upon the calm. For this reason we have placed these two works, dating from about a century ago, at the head of these pages.

How few of us think of the once famous Chesterfield in any other capacity than as the author of the elegant but immoral 'Letters to his Son'! How few are aware that the wise and benevolent friend of the good Bishop Chenevix demands from our generation the utmost allowance for the insinuating corruptions of his age! How few would not be surprised to find such words in his letters as these:—

'I am sensible that I shall be reckoned a very shallow politician for my attention to such objects as the improvement of your lands, the extension of your manufactures, and the increase of your trade. So weak am I, that I would be much rather distinguished and remembered by the name of the Irish Lord Lieutenant than by that of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland'!*

Or by the following:—

'Mind your weaving and spinning, and lay aside politics. The former will enrich you; but, take my word for it, you will never be the better for the latter. . . . What, says Mr. L., to be dependent on England! Yes, I hope so; for when Ireland is independent of England, the Lord have mercy upon it!'†

Chesterfield's reputation as a statesman was already made when he was called upon to take the government of Ireland. His career at that time, and afterwards, is so instructive that we shall make no apology for a short sketch of it, quite as much with a view to exhibiting the spirit of sympathy which he expressed as to bring out the facts of the case.

The new Lord Lieutenant began by the unusual act of selecting a Secretary who was to differ from his predecessors in having nothing to do. 'I will do the business myself,' said he, 'being determined to have no first minister' (vol. i. p. 152). He next openly declared that if any one should make a successful application to the King for any place in His Majesty's gift through any other channel but his own, he would immediately throw up the Lord Lieutenancy. Thus the fountains of jobbery were stopped at the source, the upper classes found out they had a ruler, and the country fixed its eyes on one who seemed to be a real man.

* *Miscellaneous Works*, vol. ii. p. 547.

† *Ibid.*, pp. 515, 516.

How would he deal with the Roman Catholics, who were five to one more numerous than the Protestants, and who up to this time had been in constant intercourse with the Pretender's family? His biographer tells us:—

‘Popery and Jacobitism were supposed to be inseparable, and it was thought that the only way to check the progress of either was strictly to carry into execution and enforce the Penal Laws enacted against both. Lord Chesterfield could not have been censured had he conformed to the method practised in the three kingdoms, and particularly at that time in England. Upon the first breaking out of the Rebellion, the private Popish chapels in the metropolis had been searched for and ordered to be shut up; proclamations were issued to compel the priests to leave the capital; and the refractory were imprisoned and threatened with severe punishments. The new Lord Lieutenant did not want for advisers who pressed him to follow this example. His enlarged notions of humanity and true politics induced him to pursue a different and much wiser course: He allowed the Roman Catholics the free use of their religion; and, far from attempting to shut up their places of worship, he rather wished them to continue open, and prevented any disturbance from being given to those who resorted to them.’

‘A known agent of the Pretender was privately sent for to the Castle. ‘Sir,’ said Lord Chesterfield, ‘I have sent for you to exhort your friends to be peaceable and quiet. If they behave like faithful subjects they shall be treated as such; but if they act in a different manner, I shall be worse to them than Cromwell.’ His biographer justly doubts if he meant this to be more than a threat; but the

‘conversation, together with his watchful eye, had such an effect that not one of them stirred during the whole time of the Rebellion, and all the informations against particular persons were found absolutely groundless. His efforts to remove prejudices and maintain harmony and mutual benevolence were seconded by writers whom he encouraged to support the same cause.’

Amongst others, the celebrated Bishop Berkeley devoted his talents to the task.

‘His letter to the Roman Catholics of his diocese was worthy of a Christian bishop. He endeavoured to dissuade his fellow-citizens and neighbours from falling into the same errors which had been fatal to their fathers, and, appealing to their reason, convinced them that their situation was as advantageous as they could wish it to be, and that it would be the height of imprudence to engage in a dangerous cause to which neither interest did invite nor conscience did oblige them.’

The result is thus described:—

‘The Irish priests, sensible of the gentleness of the present adminis-

tration, co-operated with their Protestant brethren to maintain order and tranquillity. Their pastoral letters, public discourses from the pulpit, and private admonitions were equally directed for the service of government.'

'In the meanwhile Lord Chesterfield neglected no precautions, and prepared himself for all events. If the Rebellion had reached Ireland he had taken the resolution of commanding the army in person. Though he was himself no soldier, he believed he could assist with his counsels those who were.'

'The Protestants in general gave on this occasion uncommon marks of zeal.' Chesterfield would not allow regiments to be raised by great men for fear of jobs and jobbers; but he encouraged Protestant associations throughout the island. The county of Antrim alone furnished upwards of 30,000 men, and the city of Dublin provided a regiment of horse militia consisting of 6,000 men, and three of foot of 2,000 men each, besides several independent companies. So strong did he find himself that, instead of increasing the small force of regular troops then in Ireland, he parted with four battalions to reinforce the Duke of Cumberland's army in England, thus helping the hard-pressed Cabinet, which was begging him for assistance to put down the dreaded Highlanders. His financial measures and his management of the Irish Parliament showed equal skill; but the following passage may be quoted as bearing on our present subject, and showing how firmness and conciliation were united in his person:—

'He projected new barracks to be built in those parts of the kingdom which are not amenable to the laws of the country. By these provisions he wished to make the inhabitants know that there is a God, a King, and a Government.' 'No person in so high a station was ever more easy of access. His door was open generally from nine in the morning to three in the afternoon to any one who requested an audience. Nobody appeared in fear before him, none retired discontented; his manner of granting favours added to their value, and his refusals were softened with engaging marks of concern. Where he could redress he did it speedily, and was particularly ready to assist the weak against the oppressions of the strong.'

Several instances are given. But we must not deprive others of their due.

The adviser, next to Bishop Chenevix, on whom he most relied was the wise Bishop Synge, with whose ideas the following policy, very much to the purpose of this article, was in accordance. 'Chesterfield thought,' says his biographer, 'the only honest and effectual methods to be employed with regard to Roman Catholics were good usage, supporting

‘the Protestant Charity (or Charter) Schools, and adhering ‘strictly to the Gavel Act.’ His approval of the last of these methods of treating Roman Catholics is no bad index of the times. That such fair-minded men could think it just to offer a premium on conversion to Protestantism dictated by self-interest illustrates the tenacity of institutions adopted from the dread of having to repeat the conquest of a conquered portion of the people.* On the same principle, he advocated the abolition of the restrictions on the purchase of land by Roman Catholics; their money would thus be kept in Ireland, and the estates ultimately revert to Protestants. On the other hand he, like Bishop Syngé, wished to put an end to the worn-out system of mere connivance, and pressed in vain for a registration of priests (with a limitation of their numbers), as also for a new Oath of Allegiance to the English king, dispensing with the obnoxious Oaths of Supremacy and Abjuration. These ideas were far in advance of the age; but if they had been accepted, however clogged with the remnants of the earlier policy, the retrospect of Ireland might have presented itself in a different way to the historian. However, the mere circulation of such ideas in high quarters, accompanied by the visible display of ‘mild ‘treatment and easy, unsuspicious intercourse with the ‘Roman Catholics,’ produced an extraordinary effect on a warm-hearted people, not yet poisoned with the sentiments imbibed a generation later from the revolted colonists of America.

‘Distinctions of parties seemed to be abolished, and animosities to be forgotten, as well as prejudices and suspicions. Religion became what it ought to be, a bond of union instead of an instrument of discord; superstition was enlightened, and fanaticism disarmed. Hence a phenomenon took place not often observed in times of tranquillity—Protestants and Roman Catholics, natives and strangers, well-wishers and enemies to the Pretender, all alike influenced by the example of their beneficent Governor, indulged, respected, and would have loved one another, if he had continued a longer time among them.’ ‘Persons of all ranks, denominations, and religions followed him, on his departure from Ireland, to the water-side, to which he walked, and from which he publicly embarked.’

* There was something to be said for the policy of breaking up Roman Catholic estates by abolishing the primogeniture which the English had themselves introduced; the sting of the Gavel Act lay in the provision that, if any one of the ‘nearest of kin’ who should succeed to the inheritance turned Protestant, he became *ipso facto* the heir-at-law.

Nor did his zeal for the welfare of Ireland come to an end with his office. He never ceased to encourage native industries and to support the Protestant schools. He continued to advise the Irish against their pernicious habit of hard drinking, which during office he had so effectually restrained that 'no person was ever seen drunk in public 'during that time.' Pressing forward the Irish manufacture of glass bottles, he exclaims: 'I wish every man in Ireland 'were obliged to make as many bottles as he empties. Your 'manufacture would soon be a very flourishing one indeed.' Writing twenty-one years after the administration which we have thus epitomised, his biographer remarks that 'it is 'still revered by all ranks and orders of men.' The effects of his influence did not cease to operate during that period.

Let us now turn to Arthur Young. We have a well-known picture of Ireland, painted in 1776 and the two following years by this celebrated observer, the more valuable as it was taken just before the face of Ireland was changed by the American War and the consequent establishment of what is called 'Grattan's Parliament.' He describes the bound of material prosperity which had been proceeding unchecked throughout Ireland during the previous generation. 'The great spirit began in 1749 and 1750;' i.e. from the time when the operation of the causes of prosperity above mentioned had been brought to a head by Chesterfield, when the people had become so united that a sense of security had succeeded to suspicious fear, and when the disorders, which could indeed at any time be reproduced by the tyrannical working of the old institutions, had become exceptional. Even the migration to America of the oppressed Presbyterians, which no doubt formed a bitter ingredient in the spirit of American revolt, did not in Young's opinion materially injure Ireland, but rather carried off a turbulent and non-productive element of Irish society. The apparition of the 'Whiteboys' was, he maintains, local, grew out of natural causes, and was easily put down as soon as ever it was firmly resisted. In the West of Ireland lands, at rents which had doubled during the previous twenty years, were selling at twenty years' purchase. The labourers had a 'fair belly-full of potatoes and milk, 'with a cow to depend upon, and were better off than their 'brethren in England.' Numerous are the instances he gives of the enterprise and success of landlords. The fitful gusts of discontent then beginning to rise might, he believed, be laid by the union with England, which he advocated,

and by a remission of the Penal Laws, which, however, had been so far a dead-letter that 'mass-houses,' as he calls them, were to be seen in every direction. Yet his honest heart revolts at the slavish position of the Celtic peasantry; and he pronounces that the time had come when the system of Protestant ascendancy should give way to the establishment of equal laws and an organised system of governing England and Ireland as a united people. In short, the methods of government established after the conquest of Ireland, modified first by Walpole and secondly by Chesterfield, had become obsolete. George the Third, as Mr. Froude has well shown,* had done much for the better government of the country, some excellent Lords Lieutenant had succeeded Chesterfield, and absence from their Government during a portion of their term of office, called the 'fallow year,' too long winked at, had ceased to be permitted; but this was no time for the creation of a new system in place of the old. England itself was in no condition to supply it, and the better parts of the old Irish system were sinking away before the portentous growth of the worse. Conciliation without organic change only precipitated rebellious sentiments; the new ideas from America spread like wild-fire; the distress which England suffered under the general rising up of Europe and America against her newly formed Empire prevented her from giving sufficient attention to the defence of Ireland; the 'Volunteers,' with plausible pretences, assumed the direction of affairs; the ties which united the Parliament of England with that of Ireland were violently snapped asunder,—and we know the result. No fair-minded person can dispute the failure of the Separatist Parliament, ending in rebellion, re-conquest, and a forced union.

But the previous half century must on no account be confused with the succeeding time. Measured by abstract ideas it was faulty enough; so also was the government of England. But taken historically, as the consequence of previous events, it at least secured the ends of government, and in so doing gave rest, material prosperity, peace and comfort to the land. That in spite of Penal Laws and degrading distinctions such an administration as Chesterfield's should have been possible, speaks volumes; but it may be worth observing that neither does this testimony nor that of Arthur Young stand alone. The private memoirs of the time have by no means as yet been sufficiently ransacked, and a few passages from a 'Tour

* *The English in Ireland*, vol. ii. p. 41.

‘in Ireland,’ made in 1773 and never yet published, may not be unacceptable.

After detailing how much yet remained to be done as to police and the cultivation of land, the writer, a very trustworthy observer, who had the best opportunities for judging, goes on to say:—

‘The real comfort is that, let the patriots say what they will, things are manifestly tending to improvement. In the single article of breaking up new ground, which is the first beginning of civilisation, incredible tracts of country, everybody will acknowledge, have been lately put to use. I suppose there is not a gentleman within a hundred miles of Dublin who has not attempted to reclaim the third part of his bogs within these twenty years. I grant it is commonly done in a very slovenly manner; but still the spirit that attempts it in any manner is good. With some it succeeds to admiration, insomuch that I have been shown tracts of country as far as the eye could reach which have very lately from bog been made arable and pasture. Another sign of improvement is that the people are at present eager in exacting the residence of their clergy, and are obliging, but also encouraging, them to build parsonage houses on their livings. This in time will have a very good effect, for though I doubt not the clergy will be cunning enough to elude their obligation to residence, yet here will always be one good house in a parish, and many acres around it improved. The ruinous state of the churches and the fewness of parsonage houses have till now been only too plausible excuses for the clergyman’s desertion of his flock and his very shameless manner of providing for the offices of a parish, which is frequently 1,200*l.*, and so on downward to 400*l.* a year. This last may upon the whole be called the mean value of the Irish livings. It is to be noted that no archdeacon in Ireland has any jurisdiction; the bishop has everywhere swallowed it up, and he is generally but too much engaged to attend to the state of the churches of his diocese.’

The writer cannot of course refuse to notice the chronic evils of Ireland—the multitude of beggars, the dirt and squalor of the peasantry, the absenteeism, the absence of a middle class, the lingering barbarity of a bygone age still cropping up, the lawlessness of certain districts, the illiterate gentry, the waste and recklessness of households; above all, the chorus of complaints ‘as to the undone state of poor ‘Ireland,’ which tasks the vocabulary of the patriots, while they decline to stir a finger to remove grievances of their own creating. Not seldom, however, he comes across a more cheerful view of Irish politics:—

‘In general, my acquaintance has lain amongst the croakers, but I have seen likewise a few who do not despair of the republic. By what I can see, hear, or understand, the inhabitants of this kingdom are subject to many internal difficulties, oppressions, and absurdities quite as prejudicial as those laid on them by Great Britain. There

are three or four difficulties, which, if they could be removed, would instantly produce the most salutary consequences. I cannot help wondering why they do not attempt to lighten at least the burden, if they cannot take it off, rather than indulge the preposterous and ridiculous hope of throwing off their dependence on England, which, however fond they are of indulging it secretly, would in fact prove equally prejudicial to both. If they would let their lands at a moderate price, if they would annihilate the order of undertakers, if they would repeal the sanguinary law against the Papists, and all ranks of men live with a little more economy, it would be a great and flourishing kingdom, notwithstanding the jealousy and even obstructions the English throw in its way. More than a little island subordinate to a greater one it never can be, and I think no man in his senses would ever wish it to be.'

We may conclude these extracts with the writer's account of the way in which one Irish nobleman at least—Lord Dartrey of Dawson Grove, with whom he stayed six weeks—did his duty; and this good man was certainly not singular. He did indeed reside with his whole family for only two months in the year, the rest of which they spent in London, he himself frequently coming over; but his care for his people extended equally over the whole year.

'The conduct and behaviour of this nobleman towards his neighbours, his dependents, his servants, and the poor, is so judicious and benevolent that it would justify the most extravagant reception of him [a reception which he describes]. One cannot live here half an hour without seeing an infinite variety of ways in which a man may be of use to his fellow-creatures, and 'tis really very curious to see how many of them are practised by this man.'

He then explains how he protected the poor of the district from the rapacity of the undertaker or middleman, and had, in fact, broken down the system in his neighbourhood; how, 'besides a formal dispensatory in the house, which has a dreadful appearance, and the natural quacking of my lady, there is a surgeon at the neighbouring town retained to visit all the poor who want his assistance';

how he had

'planned and procured an Infirmary to the Great Foundling Hospital at Dublin, and just given 350*l.* to the County Infirmary; and how his father and himself had provided a parish church and school, where he keeps the schoolmaster, and pays for the children. Lady Dartrey has also her own peculiar school, the children of which come once a week to be examined. Lord Dartrey's cottages are rent free, each with an allotment of three or four acres of land, and firewood off the estate. In the mode of relieving the poor tenants he varies as the necessities of the season vary. The year in which meal is cheap, flax is dear, and *vice versâ*. Each of these being retailed with great extortion to the

poor, he sells them flax by the pound or meal by the bushel at a low price. This is no slight, yet not an expensive, humanity. I am credibly informed that this year these undertakers sell flax at 14*d.* a pound, which when spun, after three days' labour of a family, will not sell for above 16*d.* The natural price of it is 10*d.* After church to-day I was introduced to twenty children, clothed and put to school by Lady Dartrey, and assisted at her examination of the clothes and learning of every one, and at the registering of every one's dress and accomplishments. I really cannot see what one person can do more to soften the sorrows and alleviate the miseries of many.'

The last touch must not be omitted :—

'Every morning a paper is laid on Lord Dartrey's table, informing him in what part of his grounds he may find his labourers, and in what work employed. It always ends thus: "Two boys, one at each avenue, "to keep the beggars from the house." Thus it must be, even at the most hospitable mansion in Ireland.'

These few extracts will suffice to fill up the picture given by Arthur Young a few years later. There is nothing, as the last-quoted writer says, to lead a man to despair of the republic in these faithful sketches. The effect of a period of rapid improvement had not yet had full time to develope itself. Abuses seemed in a fair way of removal; a public opinion was forming itself; bright spots gleamed out hopefully. Absenteeism was not the rule. Lord Dartrey's splendid example was not likely to be thrown away, nor, though far above the average, was it isolated. England itself could show few such. Study the picture of the English boor of those days, with his mere animal life and brutal sports, before any thought of village schools had crossed the English mind; or turn to Goldsmith's lovely picture of what a poor Irish clergyman could do even at the time when the visitor quoted above found so much fault with the class. Was the class, as a class, much more awake to its sacred obligations in the larger island? Were the bishops much more alive to the state of their churches and the need of constant visits to the parishes under their rule? If the agriculture, the commerce, the wealth of the English were in advance of the Irish, was the advance greater than might fairly be expected in a country which had escaped the horrors of war for so many centuries? Was not the condition of Ireland very much like that of a conquered colony settling down after the struggle, slowly learning self-government, and in a fair way of receiving gradually the civilisation of its stronger neighbour?

If Arthur Young's prophecies of the healing effects

which would follow on the removal of the Penal Laws and the Union with England were somewhat too sanguine when tested by the actual result, he might be justified on the hypothesis that those events had taken place soon after he wrote. It is instructive to observe the greatly increased sharpness and bitterness of tone with which in his Appendix he speaks of Irish abuses, only a year or two after the body of his work was written. The crisis was sweeping on with the force of Niagara. The disasters of the English in America had by this time shaken her empire to the foundation. France and Spain were leaping at her throat. Concessions after concessions to Irish demands were only making government from England more impossible. Union, free trade, and free religion were the only barriers Young could discover against separation. 'Treat them,' he cries, 'like men that ought to be free.' He could not be expected to foresee that a virtual separation was on the very eve of taking place, and that a new rebellion would be required to stamp the policy of an enforced Union upon Great Britain. Still less could he be expected to understand that his views were premature, and that the prejudices of a whole century—of many centuries—could not be shaken off in a moment by the mere force of reason and the expostulation of a few enlightened men. Nations cannot be driven into rapid changes of front. Experience, time, failure, and disappointment all play their destined part. At last the moment comes. The times are changed, and with them the responsible actors. The leaders of thought are in their graves, but their work remains. What Arthur Young and Pitt, Cornwallis and Fitzwilliam think in one generation, becomes the opinion of the public in the next. Nothing is really lost when the whole sum of the series is taken into account. If these remarks sound in our ears remarkably like truisms it is a good sign. They cannot claim to have been accepted into the family by writers and speakers upon Irish history.

We pass over, then, in this sketch the next half century of the separate Parliament, and all that followed from it, down to the period of the great Acts which opened out a new period of history; remarking only that the progress which has been noticed in the Ireland of the eighteenth century never really stopped, in spite of all the obstructions which political events of the first magnitude threw in the way. The Union itself, though it was far from satisfying the demands of the Irish, ushered in a great increase of commercial activity. Irishmen had borne their full share in the glories of the

Great War, and reaped a full harvest of honours and profits. With the peace came the cry for Reform in both islands alike. Institutions which could not be touched during the struggle for national existence demanded to be recast, and when those who had been bred in the war school could resist no longer, recast they were. It is the period of the next forty years to which we must now direct our attention. The great outlines of the war period, even in Ireland, are familiar, and its lessons have been registered; but it is proverbially difficult to get at the real history of the years which old and middle aged men remember well enough, but which is already separated from modern politics by a considerable space. We lie at the mercy of almost any audacious assertion; it is still a personal matter; speeches and papers may be quoted for almost any contradictory statements; the calm voice of impartial history has not yet been heard above the tumult of opposing cries. The following sketch of the time is at least new, and may serve for a beginning.

The Union of Great Britain with Ireland had lifted the latter country out of the subordinate position of a dependent province into that of a joint member with Great Britain in the government of the empire which Irishmen had powerfully helped to create, defend, and secure. The Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, along with the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts now opened up a new state of things, and the Reform Bill soon followed. Up to that time the Irish question meant—How to govern the million of people who governed the other six millions? That was the legacy of Protestant ascendancy. Every institution, every department of social life, had been welded into the system of government by Protestant landlords and citizens. The Penal Laws had indeed passed away, but the disabilities of Roman Catholics remained, and that governed the situation. Local governments had preserved under these conditions a sort of rough-and-ready order. The Lord Lieutenant, Chief Secretary, and Under-Secretary had only to follow the precedents of centuries, disregarding as long as possible the discontent of the unrepresented population. As soon, however, as that population was emancipated the problem assumed an entirely new form—a form which did not present itself in England, where the same change of laws was applied in wholly different circumstances. In the larger island there was scarcely any appreciable difference in the conduct of affairs. But in Ireland the question was no longer how to govern the one million who governed the rest, but the whole seven. Here

was an essential change, almost a revolution. The local machinery had been destroyed, and the task fell with all its weight upon the Executive.

In dealing with the history of the performance of this most serious task we must take notice not only of the measures pursued, but of the persons engaged in the operation, and the spirit in which it was undertaken. In so doing, we shall find it conducive to clearness as well as brevity if we pass over the official persons more prominently before the world—the Prime Ministers, Lords-Lieutenant, and Chief Secretaries of the period—dismissing them with the remark that one and all evinced the same desire to work loyally for the good of Ireland, and that unless they had done so their subordinates must have failed. Old things had passed away; it was a race with those at the head of affairs which could deal best with the new. Governments might differ as to the terms on which they could treat O'Connell, or the Irish Church, or upon questions of education; but indifference, injustice, carelessness, or tyranny in the government of Ireland never again found a place in high quarters. It was to be a firm and enlightened policy suited to Irish wants, but administered on English ideas. All agreed on this point, Whigs and Tories alike. Impressed with this spirit, the Government took pains to seek out agents who could be trusted to create and deal with the new organisations; and into the hands of those agents the permanent and practical administration of Ireland fell. The first of these was Captain Drummond, the second the late Sir Thomas Larcom. The interval between 1840, when Drummond died, and 1853, when Larcom succeeded to his place, though worked on the same lines, was scarcely so successfully worked; and thus the distinction generally accorded to these two remarkable men is the more emphasised. Both were Engineer officers. That splendid corps had only recently been brought to the perfection of mingled scientific and military accomplishments by the agency of the great men produced in the war. With the peace a pacific field was found for their abilities in the Ordnance Survey of England and Ireland, in the service of which both Drummond and Larcom made their fame. This union of military and civil training was precisely what the ordinary administrator could not be expected to possess. It only required the addition of official experience and loyal support from the responsible heads of departments to make it a perfect agency. Though neither of them was Irish by birth, they both became *Hibernis ipsis Hiberniores*.

Each man was specially suited for his special work ; but curiously enough the parts they played have in the popular estimation been reversed. Drummond, from his ardent sympathy with reform and his championship of the lower classes in Ireland, represented by his famous apophthegm that 'property has its duties as well as its rights,' has been credited with the more indulgent species of administration ; 'Larcom and the police,' a phrase which became proverbial during his time, has suggested the sterner species as applicable to the later official. But in reality it was to Drummond that the task fell of calling into existence the new machinery which was to take the place of the old, the strict administrative system which was necessary to carry the country through its transition stage, but which under Larcom was mingled with many other ingredients. Drummond's work may be summed up under four heads. First, the Courts of Petty Sessions, six hundred in number, were subjected to a new and complete organisation. Secondly, the system of stipendiary magistrates was adopted ; their duty being to attend the Courts and report to head quarters at Dublin. Thirdly, legal advice was given on every question for which it was demanded, the case being adjourned till the opinion of the 'Law Adviser' (a new officer most unwisely discarded in recent years) had been received. The fourth and most important organisation was that of the new Irish constabulary. This force had been hitherto a county police under the magistrates. It was now centralised under an inspector general in Dublin. In short, the centralisation of the government at the 'Castle,' which has been so often denounced of late years by the Irish 'Nationalists,' because it has been only too well adapted to its purpose, was Drummond's work. But these were only the more prominent features of the new system. Every institution in the country passed under Government control, and, what is more, the people ardently desired that it should be so. 'They everywhere mistrusted one another,' says Larcom in one of his memoranda, 'and they were all satisfied with whatever Government decided.' Writing a little before the year 1858, and remarking that a great improvement in the temper of the people had taken place, he tells us that

'applications for the attendance of the stipendiary magistrates still continue to show the greater confidence that is placed in them by the poorer class. Local government is still to some extent considered to be the handing over of one party to the tender mercies of another ; and when both parties concur in wishing for it on any particular occasion, or in any particular institution, it is to be feared it only proves that

each thinks itself strong enough to get the upper hand. So long as this feeling continues, the direct action of Government can scarcely be dispensed with, whether that action is exercised from Dublin or from London.'

These few words show how what has been complained of as arbitrary was really popular, and how the death of Drummond was looked upon as a national calamity, not only by the governing classes, but by the grateful people who had at last tasted real liberty in connexion with efficient control at the hands of power. Drummond was carried off still young, just when he was about to rise, no one could say how high; but his name can never be forgotten when the modern history of Ireland is mentioned. He brought to his work not only genius, talent, and training, but sympathy. In him the glow of popular sentiment, which was on everybody's lips at the time of the Reform Bill, was not simulated. He meant what he said, translated it into act, and taught the Irish that the reign of order and justice, fearlessly and impartially applied with scientific completeness, was the reign of peace and happiness. As this is generally admitted it need not be further pursued here. By the consent of all, this period of five years (1835-1840) was a bright spot in the picture which was again to be clouded over for a time.

The clouds may be traced on this occasion more from an internal than an external quarter, and may be fairly considered as the natural result of the process of fermentation and settling down of the new elements of social and political life. These elements were combining under new conditions, and under the ultimate control of new agencies. Larcom in another of his minutes sums up the troubles of Ireland in the following category: 'Tithe war, Insurrection Acts, 'Repeal agitation, monster meetings, famine, fever, and 'rebellion'—a frightful list. It was 'this sea of troubles' against which the new organisation had to 'take arms,' and in the midst of which it was to carry forward its beneficent work.

'Advancing society required new establishments. The state of Ireland year after year engrossed the attention of Parliament. Tithes and Church temporalities, reform, parliamentary and municipal, were in succession provided for by legislation. Education was the next great measure; then public works, the railway commission, harbours, navigation, and extensive river-works like the Shannon, Corrib, and the Bann, with general and local drainage. Many other physical enlargements of industry evinced the energy and activity of the Government in bringing Ireland forward to the level of the sister

country more rapidly than local or individual efforts could have done. Next, the poor law provided and regulated a system of legal charity in food and shelter, and subsequently in medical relief. Then the famine tested and strained to the cracking-point the new institutions and the social condition of the country. It enlarged the poor law, and introduced the Encumbered Estates Courts; more and better than all, the famine left behind it a conviction of the necessity for self-dependence and local self-government. Various minor institutions, hospitals, asylums, convict systems, and other establishments have all been remodelled and reformed.'

He concludes, with a pardonable pride, as follows:—

'Contrast the Ireland of to-day (1858) with that of fifty years ago, depicted, e.g. in the Duke of Wellington's Correspondence, and in the difference read the effect of the care and influence of the mode of government which has effected it.'

Larcom in making this retrospect might well murmur: 'Quorum pars magna fui.' It may be of some use to run briefly through his career, since no memoir of him has yet appeared beyond an obituary notice in the Proceedings of the Royal Society, and since in studying that career we are in the way of arriving at the inner history of Irish government during the last period of tranquillity which the Irish have enjoyed. We say 'the last period,' for immediately after his retirement in 1869 a series of measures in relation to the Church, the land, and the question of Home Rule, commenced; and to deal with them here would be beyond our province. Thus the above date closed, not only Larcom's career, but an era of constitutional government framed upon the basis of preceding historical facts. Now commenced the system of governing Ireland on abstract principles—often described as government 'on Irish ideas;' but these ideas might still better be described as the ideas of one part of Ireland exclusively of the rest. On the other hand, Drummond and Larcom, as already said, represented the system of government on English ideas, based on fair play to all existing parties, religions, and races, and yet inspired by a sympathy for Ireland and the Irish quite as real and active as any that has ever been shown even by born Irishmen.

It was not till middle life that Larcom was summoned to fill the post of Irish Under-Secretary which, thirteen years previously, Drummond had vacated by death. He thus had the advantage of a training in Irish affairs for no less than twenty-seven years before he was called upon to apply his experience. It is interesting to observe that his work in the Ordnance Survey betrayed, almost from its commencement,

the bias which characterised his career. Instead of being satisfied with the merely scientific operations for which it had been instituted, he conceived the idea of making the Survey subservient to the best interests of his adopted country by connecting it with the history, antiquities, literature, and statistics of the island. For this purpose he applied himself to the study of the old Irish language, discovered or created agents to work under him in the collection of information, inspired the more active Irish minds with his own enthusiasm, overcame a thousand difficulties, and ended by producing a prodigious body of local information which has already been of the greatest service to Ireland and will be still more useful in the future. From the merely antiquarian point of view, with which we are not here concerned, the words of the learned Dr. Todd may be quoted as a fair expression of the value of this work. As President of the Royal Irish Academy, he pronounced that

‘this information has been of singular interest, since it has been collected at a period when traditions still lingered in districts now wholly altered in their character by emigration, and by the change that has taken place as to the owners of the soil, the rapid growth of agricultural improvement, and the construction of railways. In many places it will be found that the descriptions and drawings presented in the collection are now the only remaining record of monuments which connect themselves with our earliest history and of the folk-lore which the famine swept away with the aged Seannachies who were its sole repositories.’

From the celebrated establishment at Mountjoy, in Phoenix Park, Dublin, which under Larcom’s hands became the model for all similar institutions, went forth an army of workers whose labours bore fruit in the splendid maps of the Survey, ‘the first general maps of any country in Europe in ‘which the ground was completely delineated as one whole.’ When the geology, the nature of the soil, the condition of agriculture, the statistics of population, the local institutions, and the history of every spot and portion of Ireland was thus thoroughly investigated and registered, a great step had been taken towards the scientific completeness of a central government, and a foundation was laid for all subsequent improvements. The Survey led to the regular collection of agricultural statistics by Larcom’s now experienced staff, which was published every year, and then to the establishment of an Irish census, in which for the first time in the history of the three kingdoms the classification and condition of the population were registered as well

as its numbers. Larcom created these institutions, which were subsequently incorporated into one another, the Registrar General taking charge of a permanent branch formed in his department for the collection of agricultural statistics. In the course of time England adopted the plan of the Irish census; but even Larcom's advocacy and Sir G. Cornwall Lewis's enlightened efforts in its favour failed to establish in the larger island the statistical branch which has done so much for the developement of Irish resources. In other ways, and at an even earlier date, the Ordnance Survey was made, under Larcom's hands, splendidly subservient to the material welfare of Ireland. In 1832 he prepared for Government the plans required for working out the changes made necessary by the Irish Reform Bill, and in 1836 the topographical portion of the Report on Irish Municipal Reform, when elaborate plans and maps of sixty-seven towns were prepared and presented to the Government in the course of a single month. In 1837 and 1838 he executed the maps already mentioned with a view to commencing on a scientific plan the railways of Ireland. Thus, by incessant labours as a scientific military officer, Larcom was trained for his adoption into the Civil Service of Ireland in 1846. His post was now that of Commissioner of Public Works. He had scarcely accepted it when the sudden outbreak of the terrible Irish famine summoned him to devote the whole of the skill and experience he had acquired in order to cope with the new enemy.

Like many other subjects which must be excluded from this sketch, we must omit the famous Irish famine, the most serious affliction of the sort which has befallen Europe in modern times. If it may be said without irreverence, Larcom, like Joseph in Egypt, seemed by his whole previous career to have been prepared to deal with this most exceptional phenomenon.* It fell naturally to the man who had unfolded Ireland to herself, and was now employed in the very office which dealt with these matters, to be placed in the practical direction of the public works, by which the starving population were to be saved from extinction, and at the same time utilised for the public weal. If those works were open,

* These expressions must not be taken to exclude or depreciate the noble work done by Sir Richard Griffiths and many other friends of Sir Thomas Larcom; but it is his career, and his alone, which spans the whole compass of the period before us and of the operations here briefly summarised.

when the crisis was past, to adverse criticism; it must be admitted that they admirably answered their purpose at the time. That wonderful organisation of relief, that splendid liberality of the English people on the occasion, are not yet forgotten, though the name of the man who was brought to death's door through his immense exertions in the cause of Ireland is in the fair way of passing out of memory. Like the famine, the 'Cabbage-garden Rebellion' of Smith O'Brien may also be passed over here. Such an organic social change as the sinking away by starvation and emigration of the Irish population from eight to little more than six millions could not but affect the attitude of the Irish agitator; and the cries for Repeal, which had died away in the agony of the distress, found vent once more at a moment when Europe was suffering in all her limbs from the epidemic of revolution. This was only a serious matter in so far as it was a symptom of latent disease in the body politic. The whole question of the Poor Law had now to be faced, and Larcom was placed in 1848 at the head of a Commission of Inquiry. Next year he held the same place in the Commission for the Reform of the Dublin Corporation. In 1850 he was deputy-chairman of the Board of Works, and having run through several other offices in connexion with the Queen's University and the learned bodies which he had founded or helped to found, he became Under-Secretary for Ireland in 1853.

Larcom's tenure of the Under Secretaryship of Ireland was distinguished from that of Drummond, or any other of his predecessors, by being made permanent. The Government had trained their man, and they wisely resolved to keep him. He retained his post for sixteen years, and retired only when worn out by incessant exertion and an immense responsibility. If he had been Viceroy for those sixteen years he could not have been more entirely identified during that time with the government of Ireland. Each of these great officers—Lords St. Germans, Carlisle, Eglinton, Kimberley, and the Duke of Abercorn—Whigs and Tories alike, vied with each other in their recognition of his services. Men like Lord Clarendon and Lord Mayo were his enthusiastic friends; splendid gifts of plate and flattering addresses were presented on his resignation; and till the infirmities of old age intervened, he was frequently consulted upon Irish affairs by subsequent Governments. Nor did his forty years of Irish service extinguish his active efforts for her welfare. With the farsightedness of a

philosopher he determined that nothing should be wanting on his part to preserve for future generations the records of his own time. Knowing well the mischief which had been done by one-sided history and falsified records, he employed many years of his later life in collecting and putting into available form every document, speech, report, or illustration which could serve as materials for the future historian of the period through which he had lived. These were handsomely bound in many hundreds of thick volumes, and distributed, according to his Will, amongst the various learned Societies, chiefly in Ireland, with which he had been associated. He died in 1879.

So much has been necessary, in the absence of a biography, in order to place before our eyes the living agency under which Ireland enjoyed a longer period of tranquillity than has often fallen to her lot. It is a picture of the life and training of the man who represented the system under which the united Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, taught by experience, deliberately resolved that Ireland should be governed. Let us gather up the different parts of that system, and display the results; we may then mark the quarter from whence the new clouds arose.

In many respects Larcom's administration was only a continuation and developement of that of his friend Drummond. The Courts, the stipendiary magistrates, the law adviser at the Castle, the constabulary, were all at work, and had been at work for nearly twenty years when he took the reins. A body of precedents had been formed, and the friction inseparable from new machines had already been largely reduced by practice. On one point regarding the circumstances of the country in 1853 Larcom's position was especially analogous to that of Drummond. As the latter was appointed for the purpose of organising the fresh measures of government made necessary by the Emancipation and Reform Acts, so Larcom took office at a moment when the famine had caused a vast reduction of the population, calling for many fresh adjustments, and when the extinction of the abortive rebellion of 'Young Ireland' immediately following the famine had left the country, as Larcom once expressed it, in a 'condition of such complete syncope that the Government 'might have been revived in any form.'

It may be a question whether advantage should have been taken of this state of affairs to make a change in the centralised methods of government which had prevailed for the previous twenty years. If any such change had been effected

it must have been in the direction of restoring some portion of the self government which, before Drummond's time, had been in the hands of the Protestant landlords and townsmen. It would now have been introduced of course in connexion with a more pronounced form of direct government from the English Home Office in London. The Roman Catholics must have been admitted to their full share of this self-government; the agency of the offices at Dublin Castle must have been sensibly modified; perhaps, as has often been suggested, the Lord Lieutenancy abolished: a Secretary of State in London or Dublin would have been appointed to fill his place. Something of this sort was in the mind of Lord John Russell in 1850, when, with the co-operation of the experienced Lord Clarendon, he moved and carried in the House of Commons, by a majority of 295 to 70, the abolition of the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. When, however, the bill came up to the House of Lords, the Duke of Wellington, whose every word was regarded at this period with a feeling almost akin to superstition, completely crushed it out by the simple remark: 'My Lords, am I to place Her Majesty's troops under the command of the Lord Mayor of Dublin? 'My Lords, I'll not do it.' Even at the advanced age to which the British Nestor had attained, he generally went to the bottom of a subject. Mr. Roebuck revived the question in 1857 and 1858, but successive Governments, finding out by this time that the measure was really unpopular in Ireland, declined to support him. When we have traced Larcom's administration a little further, we may think it worth while to take his views upon this much vexed question. At any rate he was called upon to deal with Ireland on the centralised system adopted under Drummond, and prevailing with scarcely any change to the present day.

With his memory, therefore, we associate no heroic measures. His business was to give rest to a long-troubled land, to govern all parties alike with even-handed justice, to remove official abuses of every kind, to use the utmost vigilance lest the old evils should reappear, to anticipate outbreaks not only by means of the most extensive and accurate information, but by the sense which thus came to be entertained of the ubiquity of government; above all, to develop the material prosperity of the country and bring to bear upon all its wants the wholly unique knowledge which he had spent his life in acquiring. He felt that what Ireland required was time—time and tranquillity. An absolutely strict Executive, omitting no single detail of its work, along

with perfect consistency and loyal support at the hands of his superiors, was needed in order to obtain this result—a truly loyal support which, it has already been said, Larcom received. There was in those days no sign of that ‘feebleness of the Executive’ which has been charged against it at a later date. It was a strict maintenance of the supremacy of the law on exactly the same principles as prevailed in England. Says one of Larcom’s oldest and wisest friends:—

‘Larcom knew the Irish character well, its strength and its weakness, and that it required to be controlled by a strong but gentle hand. I might compare his influence on the action of the Executive to the operation of the governor in a steam-engine, which regulates and controls its motions, and without which they would become eccentric and uncertain.’

Larcom’s success was greatly furthered by the manner in which his appointment was received by those Irish newspapers which made it their business to criticise with no sparing hand the acts of the Government. The ‘Freeman’s Journal’ of Jan. 29, 1853, went so far as to declare (what was not true) that it was

‘the first symptom of a desire to appoint men to offices because they had displayed qualities that fitted them for public service. . . . The appointment of Major Larcom seems to savour of the same spirit in which the late lamented Captain Drummond was appointed. Long connected with the country, intimately acquainted with the condition of the people, favourably impressed with regard to the history and antiquities of the country, thoroughly informed on all that relates to the statistics of its agriculture, its commerce, its trade, and its manufactures, capable of originating and equally capable of completing plans for the developement of the resources of the country, with all of which he is acquainted, Major Larcom’s appointment is one of which the Government may justly feel proud.’

If in his turn he came to experience the disapproval of some portions of the Irish press, it was not from any failure to fulfil all the expectations which were thus raised, but from causes which may now be shortly described.

The first five years of Larcom’s administration may almost be said to have been unclouded. Lord Eglinton’s speech at the Royal Dublin Cattle Show at the end of that time may even yet be remembered by some as a surprise to the English people at finding that anything at all favourable was to be said concerning the condition of Ireland. But in 1859 the Phoenix conspiracy, of no great consequence in itself, and the evident outcome of a disloyal desire to check the growing loyalty of Ireland, betrayed the survival of the old discontents

amongst a certain section of the people. It turned out an entire failure; and in 1860 Larcom was able to write thus—not, it will be observed, in praise of himself:—

‘In Ireland there is increasing prosperity, general contentment, and an improved condition of all classes. To what are these advances due? To the steady efforts of each succeeding Government, however differing in the political views of party, to anticipate and assist the wants and energies of the people of all classes and creeds. I say of every Government, for I have been now for more than thirty years more or less closely connected with every Irish Government in the pursuit of industrial and social objects, and in this respect I never could see any difference between them. Crime has so far decreased in Ireland that it may perhaps soon be omitted from annual review. Offences specially reported have fallen from 10,639 in 1850 to 3,531 in 1860, agrarian offences from 162 to 60, robbery of arms from 1,006 to 377; in truth, the ordinary crime in Ireland is not great. The murdered individuals at midday which shock England are wholly exceptional. They are the last convulsive gasps of a condition of society which banded class against class and made each the enemy of the other. The causes have been removed, and they cannot exist long in a nation of free men, which Ireland now is, ruled by equal laws impartially administered.’

How little did Larcom then foresee what was to come!—but, however, not to come quite yet. An article in the ‘Times’ of Nov. 19, 1861, may be quoted as corroborative evidence. Alluding in a bantering vein to an attack of Archbishop Cullen upon Sir Robert Peel, the Chief Secretary of Ireland at that date, it says, in the incidental way which is more trustworthy than set treatises:—

‘Ireland has been growing so fat and comfortable lately that much of her old fun and fight had gone out of her. Of course we are all delighted to see her so happy, but we miss something of the excitement of the old times. Those who are not making money there—and there must be some—cannot but bewail the difference between Ireland of the present day and Ireland of fifteen years ago. There is no great sphere now for a young man with a lively imagination and a voluble tongue unless he should appear also to have an aptitude for some honest calling. There are no political Donnybrook fairs and no apparent taste for such gatherings. Now and then a lover of things as they were walks across the press, trailing his coat or his cassock behind him, and asking if any gentleman would just do him the favour to tread the least bit in the world upon it. But nothing comes of it.’

Again, in 1862, Larcom writes:—

‘The Ireland of to-day is widely different from Ireland before the famine. That calamity fell upon a country of sinking proprietors and poor tenants. Lord Devon’s Commission found two millions of people but little above starvation, all of whom fell upon the public for support

when pressure came. We have now a prosperous proprietary, and a fully employed people. The result is obvious. The miserable cottier who lived upon his produce fell by the roadside when that produce failed. The labourer is now paid by a person richer than himself, and possessed of the resources to enable him to meet the pressure, while for the very poorest, the helpless, and the aged, the law provides a relief which formerly had no existence.'

Even in 1864, when Ireland had been afflicted by a succession of bad harvests—a period of agricultural distress which the excellent Lord Carlisle, by his personal exertions and cheering presence, had done much to mitigate—Larcom remarks that 'the constabulary report that crime has never 'been so low within the memory of any one in this office.'

The fact that this was really a period of general though not unchequered prosperity did not, however, pass unchallenged. Having attracted a good deal of attention, there was some feeble effort made to question its existence. Larcom, naturally indignant, heads one of his volumes thus: 'This volume contains the controversy of 1862 and 1863 as 'to distress and decline: "I will be drowned and nobody ' "shall help me." In addition to Dr. Hancock [the able 'founder of the Irish Statistical Society] other excellent 'men entered the lists on the side of truth, faith, and reality, 'and all reasoning men are convinced. The unreasoning, 'the factious, and the traders in sedition will always remain 'as long as there is anything to trade upon.' That Larcom was perfectly justified in his verdict upon the controversy may be still further attested by the statement of Mr. James Stephens, the famous 'Head Centre' of the Fenians, who, audaciously writing an account of that movement in the 'Contemporary Review' of May 1885, declares that when he determined to 'renew the struggle broken off in 1848 'revolutionary organisation was practically dead; the people 'had lost nearly all hope in their political regeneration.' In other words, the trade of the agitator had been suspended for several years under the just and equal rule which had kept opposing parties from injuring one another and removed all barriers to social progress and national prosperity.

The Fenian movement was a terrible blow to all the true friends of Ireland; more especially to Larcom, because he felt himself taken in flank by an enemy whom he could perfectly well have anticipated and accounted for on his front. Like the movements of the previous century which burst in upon the improving Ireland of George III., Stephens and his associates rested their lever on the fulcrum of America. The

organisation of the funeral of McManus which, in 1861, led the way, was formed in the United States; from those shores arrived the main agents and the money; to those shores escaped the fugitives when the conspiracy was discovered and suppressed; there ever since has been the nursery and the headquarters of the sedition with which Great Britain has had to contend. All this, however, is too well known to require notice. On Larcom, excellently supported by Lord Kimberley and the Irish Privy Council, fell the chief burden of the incessant vigilance required—the measures necessary for dealing with the corruption of the troops (only too successfully attempted by the Fenians), the responsibility of holding all the threads of the discovery in hand till the precise moment came. This was in 1866, and in 1867 there were some subsidiary, but abortive, insurrectionary movements, for the Executive was on its guard; but the country settled down again after the great scare, and when Larcom retired, in 1868, tranquillity reigned in Ireland once more; Fenianism, ‘after a series of unparalleled reverses, was believed to be ‘extinct in the land.’ So writes Mr. Stephens, speaking of the year 1871. The following extract from a letter of Lord Mayo will properly conclude this sketch of Larcom’s career. *Laudari a laudato* is an acknowledged test.

‘I have served’ (says he, writing in 1868) ‘as the colleague of Sir Thomas Larcom for nearly four years. I cannot express too strongly the sense I entertain of the magnitude of the public service which as Under-Secretary for Ireland he has for many years performed. Ever zealous and laborious, calm in danger, cautious, and courageous, he has been in troublous and anxious times the mainstay of the Irish Government. His extraordinary knowledge of the country, of her past history, her present system of administration, and of the habits and feelings of all classes of the people, joined to his most remarkable ability, enabled him, though not without intense labour, to discharge duties more important and more responsible than can of late years have fallen to the lot of any other member of the permanent Civil Service of the Crown.’

This, then, is the man whose judgement as to certain points which have by no means lost their interest it may be of some use to cite. He left many memoranda upon the subject which has already been glanced at—that of abolishing the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. His opinion was that theory was against it, but that practically it must be retained till the Irish people had ceased to quarrel with one another and had become entirely loyal to the Throne. It had not been intended at the Union to be a permanent office; and, as we have

seen, the temptation to abolish it as a means of bringing the two islands under an identical action of the Executive seated in London had been sometimes too strong to be resisted. Larcom himself longed for it; but the following remarks show that he did not consider in his day that the time had come:—

‘As to the possibility’ (says he, writing in 1857) ‘of carrying on the Irish Government in London on its present system, there can be no doubt that it is perfectly practicable. The same letters would be received, decided upon, and answered from Whitehall as from the Castle, the machinery being all moved for the purpose. There would be the absence of the minute daily information and knowledge which arises from the numerous interviews with people of all classes in Dublin; but from this cause also there would be less interruption and less local pressure. It would be necessary to make arrangements for the connexion between the Civil Government and the Army, as the troops form a more important element in Irish Home Government than in England. At a general election (e.g. when in England every soldier is moved out of a town) it is, on the contrary, necessary in Ireland to occupy with cavalry and infantry every borough and polling place and to patrol every road leading to them. The management of so formidable a machinery could not safely be entrusted to the military authorities. At the general election just completed more than 10,000 men were employed, in addition to an equal number of constabulary; and besides sixty-nine stipendiary magistrates it was necessary to give the commissions of the peace for the occasion to eighteen county inspectors of constabulary, since the magistrates of the Government usually command more confidence than the local magistrates, who are necessarily connected with one party or the other. It would be tedious to detail all the numerous points in which the direct agency of the Government is exercised in Ireland. It is a great and pervading machinery, but, like all machinery of that nature, requiring great promptitude and vigour of administration, with every caution and care in the application of it. A central Government cannot be carried on without a centre, except indeed that the wags may still call it an Irish Government.’

Again:—

‘People who come to this country and travel through it visit the houses of the nobility and gentry and, seeing but the outside, find the same habits, manners, and education as those to which they are accustomed in England. They see, too, an improving country, an advancing agriculture, better cottages, more comfort in dress and food, education cared for, colleges and schools rising, hospitals erected, prisons with improved discipline, institutions of every kind befitting an advanced and advancing social state. They find administration and management by grand juries of their own roads and buildings, a system better perhaps than that of England, and a people intellectually and materially certainly equal to, and in some respects better off than, that of

England. Seeing this, they are slow to believe that a different mode of government is necessary.

‘But let them look to the origin of all this. It is produced by the very form of government they are denouncing. Fifty, nay, thirty, years ago things were very different. In England comfortable homesteads, thriving towns, flourishing manufactures, well-to-do people; in Ireland wealth in the few, destitution in the many—mansions and parks, and around them hovels. A dominant and a proscribed class lived side by side. It passed away, but left general and mutual distrust behind it. Above the discord stood the Government alone, the stay of both. A society so constituted, so disorganised, required a central power. Such a power was found in the old viceregal forms, and if the viceroyalty had not existed already, something like it must have been created. . . . It is far better that a part of the empire so different should not as long as it continues so be too closely combined with England in its governing machinery. . . . The mere preservation of daily peace in an excited country is a constant care. . . . The time to make the proposed change with perfect safety will be when the country is at one with itself, when the people trust the gentry and the gentry the people, when the stipendiary magistrate can be dispensed with, the police restored to the local magistrates and perhaps paid by the counties. To this state of affairs the efforts of every Government have steadily tended. . . . In the same direction has been the advance of knowledge, not only in the education of the poorer classes and in schools and colleges, but in associations such as the agricultural societies, general and local, and in the learned societies, of which it is worth noting that there were but two in Ireland in 1850, and now (1860) there are more than twenty. All these tend to engage people in common instead of separate pursuits, views, and interests.’

If this experienced officer was of opinion that the time had not come in 1860 for abolishing the ‘Castle,’ what must he have thought after the Fenian insurrection, which he put down? What would he advise now?

The extracts from the Memoranda of Sir Thomas Larcom which have been given above, point out by implication, and sufficiently for the purpose of this sketch, the attitude which he held towards the two ever-recurring Irish questions—the conflicting landed interests and the conflicting religious beliefs of the people. It was precisely the same as that of Drummond. They were both called upon to deal with what they found. There was to be no meddling interference with the private contracts and the private opinions of the Queen’s subjects; every man was to do his own duty. Just so far as men’s ideas, either on agrarian or on religious questions, took the form of conflict with the public weal and public order, they were to be opposed. Generations upon generations had grown up under relations towards the land which were the

result of ancient struggles, and could not be altered. To do 'justice' to one part of the population on the abstract principle that the land had once belonged to their ancestors was to do injustice to another part which had received them from their ancestors. It may be safely asserted that Larcom was as zealous as Drummond for the rights of the poor; but much had already been done towards the removal of a great evil in this respect before he took the helm. The famous Encumbered Estates Act of 1849 had the hearty approval and co-operation of the later officer, as it would have had, if he had been alive, of the former. It embodied their ideas. If in the course of time the tenure of large portions of Irish land had got into such a state that the owners had become helpless paupers, and wholly unable to exercise the duties of property, then let them, if they wished, relinquish their rights, and get rid of it. This was wholly impossible till the Act came into operation.

It is ridiculous to talk, as some do, of this Act having failed. It did immense service. Here was a self-acting machinery which injured no one, and which in the process of time would, it was believed, go far to redress the grievances which were then in everybody's mouth. The law of supply and demand would gradually settle the rest. To a great extent this has been the case. Agrarian crimes—another name for the assertion of fancied rights, which were no rights—must be dealt with as they occurred; emigration was to step in where congestions of population interfered with the laws of supply and demand. All disabilities had been removed; industry and foresight would help to promote the gradual rise of the lower classes, as in England; capital would flow in with the new owners of land, and this would give employment. Stability, mutual confidence, order—these were the true remedies for Irish distress. For the reduced population, no longer dependent on the potato to the same extent as previously, improved agriculture, manufactures, and commerce would now fairly well provide. Time and a strong Government were doing their work; and up to the date of Larcom's retirement there was nothing to lead him to think that exceptional treatment was required for a country which it was his pride to consider a part of England, which was certainly in advance of England in many respects, and in which the full system of English government was only suspended till the time should come when the people were ripe for the enjoyment of it.

The difficulties arising from the irreconcilable character

of a portion of the Roman Catholic priesthood and their flocks was always one of the difficulties with which the Government had to contend; but it may be questioned whether to 'Larcom' and the police the turbulence of the Orangemen was not quite as great a cause of anxiety. Nothing but the strong hand of power kept these parties from flying at each other's throats; nothing but the most absolute fairness forced either to believe that it did not represent the whole Irish nation. Drummond and Larcom commenced their public life when the Roman Catholics, both in England and Ireland, were largely symbolised by the moderate school which repudiated Ultramontanism, and scoffed at the idea that Emancipation would ever connect itself with disloyalty to the Crown. It was under the auspices of this school that the system of 'National' education was organised in Ireland. It was generally connected with the Whigs, and with Archbishop Whately as their representative; but one Government patronised it pretty much as decidedly as the other. There was in those days a very simple and widespread belief in the effects of education as a humanising force, and to a great extent it proved itself so in Ireland; but whether the attempt to give that education a neutral form which should include only such elements of religion as could be accepted by opposing creeds deserved to succeed must be matter of opinion. It was under Larcom's *régime* that the struggle between those who held opposite sides on this point was brought to a conclusion. In 1860 the system was so altered that up to the present time (1883) 'it has been more or less free from attack, and has upon the whole worked well.'* The men of this moderate school were amongst Larcom's friends. He had no belief in the necessary existence of disloyalty in creeds as such. No one sympathised more with the touching piety of the Irish peasant; no one more ardently desired to see him divested of those mischievous associations of his creed which not only injured himself but his neighbours.

But the combination of so-called 'national' sentiment with ignorance and superstition Larcom knew by sad experience to be fatal to the happiness of the people whom he loved as his own life. To sap and neutralise that combination he looked to the advance of knowledge, to the spread of education, to the united operation of men of different

* Barry O'Brien in 'Fifty Years of Concessions to Ireland,' vol. i. p. 215. The writer, however, distrusts the future success of the system.

creeds in public life. A statesman cannot perhaps look further in dealing with a mixed population of different creeds. These were the arguments for the Queen's Colleges, with which Larcom was much concerned. The public mind has ceased to regard the system with much enthusiasm, or even favour; but those who best understand the difficulties of Ireland, and the impossibility, if it could be wished, of anything like proselytism by force, or fraud, or even honest exertion, will be best able to measure the temptation which the hopes and prospects excited by these colleges held forth. It was not, as a rule, amongst the higher grades of the Roman Catholic clergy that Larcom found his difficulties. He worked with them wherever it was possible. The Phoenix conspiracy was very generally denounced from the altar; the Fenian movement was very generally discouraged by the priests. In short, while the central Irish Government was strong and English policy consistent, so long as the various sections of Irish society perceived the hopelessness of overthrowing the existing settlement as they found it established through the course of many generations, so long as the men of each class felt that they were receiving substantial justice under exactly the same laws as their English neighbours, and subject to exactly the same conditions of success or failure,—the divergency of the different lines of interest was restrained, and attempts to disturb the existing relations between parties, nationalities, and creeds were looked upon as foreign and intrusive. There was much yet to be done to remove abuses and promote progress. So also there was much to be done in England. The United Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland was to be the organ for effecting such changes.

We cannot tell whether Larcom's inbred and ingrained distrust of Irish Ultramontaniam, regarded in its ancient aspect of a disloyal creed, would have suffered him, had he lived longer, to recommend that full scope should be given to its energies, and so to admit that the neutralising and humanising methods of his day, running parallel with those of an earlier day, had failed. Nor can any one assert with confidence that the measures of self-government which he contemplated would have come speedily and safely within the range of possibility had English policy not taken a new departure. That new departure coincided with the very year of his retirement from public life, and we are only concerned here with the forty years which preceded it. This period was an advance on the long and tranquil period which

we have connected with the names of Walpole and Chesterfield ; but though different, in consequence of all that had taken place in the interval, they are capable of receiving a summary description applicable alike to both. Mistakes were made of course, and students of history only too well understand how these were brought about ; but over and above the differences of creed and race—the permanent conditions of the problem—there were two grievous evils with which every Irish Government had to contend—the poverty of the poor and the absenteeism of the rich. In both of these periods statesmen were agreed that the only remedies were to be found in the active promotion of a general improvement in trade and agriculture, the stimulation of Irish industries, the steady attraction of English capital to Ireland, and the gradual formation of a higher and better public opinion. The fundamental condition for this progressive, but necessarily slow, improvement was a firm government, ensuring order amongst a discordant population, a government impartially administered, consistently maintained through all changes of administration, and guided by an active sympathy with the desires of the people, which were to be consulted just as far as, but no farther than, they were not in conflict with the public weal.

Whether the state of Ireland has so changed during the last few years, whether recent party struggles have so demoralised the Irish that measures of an exceptional kind are now required, is the question on which the Imperial Government is called upon to make up its mind. If it turns out that such exceptional measures are necessary, the lessons conveyed by the comprehensive survey of the past on which we have ventured may be of some use ; for they indicate with precision the only conditions on which any new policy can be successfully worked.

- ART. VI.—1. *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain, described* by ADOLF MICHAELIS. Translated from the German by C. A. M. FENNELL, M.A. Cambridge: 1882.
2. *Geschichte der griechischen Plastik.* Von J. OVERBECK. Leipzig: 1857.
3. *Geschichte der griechischen Plastik.* Von J. OVERBECK. Dritte umgearbeitete und vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: 1881.
4. *Essays on the Art of Pheidias.* By CHARLES WALDSTEIN, M.A., &c. Cambridge University Press: 1885.

NEVER was there a more apposite index of the progress made in the archæology of classic sculpture in less than a single generation than the third edition of Herr Overbeck's '*History of Greek Plastic Art*,' 1881, as compared with the first of 1857. But while we congratulate him on the great recent discoveries at Mycenæ, Olympia, and elsewhere, and on the industry and general discernment with which he has incorporated their chief sculpturesque results, we feel at the same time that we are far from having heard the last word on the subject. The earlier chapters are to a great extent rewritten, and the first, especially in the treatment of Egyptian affinities, much compressed, the Mycenæan discoveries of Dr. Schliemann falling into the Homeric period. Similar is the retrenchment of the notices of the Homeric and Hesiodic shield-pieces, in which long quotations (translated) are dropped to make way for many references to Mycenæan illustration. But, more than this, we note that in the third edition the register of the '*extension and improvement of Art*' is considerably altered. Its limits, which were from Ol. 60 to 80, are now from Ol. 65 to 80; and the sepulchral effigy of Aristion, by Aristocles, classed previously in Book II. ch. iii. with the Selinuntian metopes and the Tenean Apollo, is grouped in Book II. ch. v. of the third edition with the Corcyrean Lion* and the '*Calf-bearing*' Hermes, and discussed *after* instead of *before* the Tyrannicide group and the Æginetan pediment.†

* With this lion the author compares the monument to Læna, the heroine of the Tyrannicide (see pp. 144 and 117). He should have compared the miniature one found at Mycenæ, probably a replica of a similar monumental lion ('Mycène,' p. 445), and have made some reference to that on Leonidas' tomb (Herod. vii. 225).

† See vol. i. p. 98 of 1st ed., and p. 150 of 3rd ed.

The western pediment of the Æginetan Temple of Pallas, brought home by the Crown Prince of Bavaria in 1812, has since been completed and re-arranged by the successive study of H. Prachow and K. Lange in 1871-76. Each angle as before is occupied by a recumbent figure, arrow-wounded; but the next figure at either wing is now the archer, and the entire group is now considered to have contained, including the central Pallas, fourteen figures, but small portions of two only are presented to the eye, the rest being partly concealed by other more prominent ones. The date is approximately fixed at OL. 60-70, at which time the centre of artistic activity was found at Ægina.

But when we come to the golden period of sculpture the change is not so much a re-arrangement as a revolution. The 'Otricoli bust' of Zeus in the Vatican Museum, which formed the *pièce de résistance* of the discussion on the Zeus of Pheidias in the first edition, is dismissed from view with discrediting remarks in the third*; and the only subsidiary pieces are some figures from Eleian coins, believed to represent the Zeus. To turn to the Parthenon pediments, a pair of figures in the eastern one, named 'Aglauros and Herse' in the first edition, are doubtfully designated 'Moiræ' in the third, while Herr Waldstein has, as we shall see, his own separate view as to their personality. In the 'silver period,' as we may call it, or 'second blossom-time' ('Blüthezeit) of Art,' as Overbeck has it, we find in vol. ii. ch. i. and ii., the elder Cephisodotus and Scopas occupying an inverted order, while the discussion of Praxiteles has, of course, been largely remoulded from the new resources opened at Olympia. We may notice in passing Fig. 102, facing the title-page, as about the most successful reproduction in engraving of an ancient statue, that of Hermes with the child Dionysus, which this age has seen. Dr. Waldstein devotes several pages to this highly interesting monument (Appendix II.). He says we can hardly term it a group. . . . Our whole interest and attention are arrested by the

* Compare vol. i. p. 208 of 1st ed. with vol. i. p. 257 of 3rd ed., especially the words 'Ausser aller Frage aber sollte sein . . . dass die erhaltenen Statuen der Statue in Olympia noch ungleich ferner stehn, am fernsten der in der That schlechte Verospische Zeus im Vatican, den man bis in die Neuzeit als das beste Mittel zur Vergewärtigung des Phidias'schen Werkes betrachtet hat.' We sincerely commend the hearty honesty of this admission, but a distinct reference to the 1st ed., as given above, would have enhanced its value. Still, the whole shows how far we are yet from finality on this question.

Hermes, and the infant Dionysos appears only to exist in our mind as a means to account for the expression of individual character and emotion in the Hermes, and how exquisite and plastically perfect is the expression of this emotion. The Hermes, youthful, and yet with a paternal tenderness and strength toned down to gentleness; while a breath of sweet melancholy, pleasing in its sad rhythm, rests over the whole composition. The head combines in its features all the characteristics of a youthful Hermes, and of the typically Attic youth. . . . But like a great sculptor who has thoroughly conceived the true province in his art and its means of expression, it is not only the head which Praxiteles has formed to express his feelings, his thoughts, his creative mood, however beautiful we know his heads to have been; we feel his power in the manner in which the head rests upon the neck, and the neck upon the shoulders, and the limbs join on to the body; in short, in the plastic rhythm of the whole figure as well as in the peculiar modelling of every sinew and muscle and in each smallest part of the surface.

The delicacy with which, in the engraving of Herr Overbeck's work, the muscular surfaces flow into each other under the areas of light and shade aptly illustrates the above extract, and has, we think, not been surpassed in modern art. Very different is the merit of the outline engravings, taking Fig. 138 as a specimen, facing p. 318, in which two such well-known statues as the Diane Chasseresse and the Apollo Belvidere have their facial features in effect distorted, and the fine lines of their limbs most imperfectly conveyed. And here we pause upon the last question which our space allows us to discuss in detail—the correction (?) of the 'motive' and 'attribute' of the latter statue from a diminutive bronze, supposed to be from near Janina, found in 1792, and now in the possession of Count Stroganoff. In the Belvidere statue, the left hand, which doubtless bore the 'attribute,' is unhappily the missing part. Montorsoli, in the fifteenth century, restored it as grasping the middle of a bow, and supposed the god to be watching the flight of his arrow or the result of his shot. This seems adequately to explain the *pose*, especially the gradually drooping fall of the right hand, as newly released from the string. The expressiveness of the fingers tells the tale completely. But the bronze statuette holds in the left a bag or folded skin with the Gorgon's head figured upon it, and this accordingly is now assigned to the Apollo Belvidere in lieu of the bow. But the statue and the statuette are, when closely examined, full of discordant features. The former is far more beautifully balanced on the right leg, the hip overhanging so as to be nearly vertical with the extremity of the

toe. The right limb of the statuette is figured as nearly perpendicular. In the statue the drapery, winding upwards, passes over the left arm; in the statuette it droops wholly from the shoulder down the back. The angle at which the left arm of the statue springs from the shoulder seems to show that it could not have held its hand so low as in the statuette, where it is level with the lowest part of the baldrick; whereas Montorsoli, guided probably by the muscles of the upper arm, places it at the level of the god's shoulder, a little relaxed, in short, from the attitude of shooting. The statuette is supposed to represent Apollo shaking the ægis to intimidate the Greeks, from *Iliad* xv. 221 foll. If so, it is one of the feeblest exponents of a motive which has yet been swept up from the refuse of ancient art. The direction of Zeus to Apollo is, in the poem, to 'take the ægis in his hands' (*ἐν χερσέσσιν*), which is of course executed literally (see vv. 229, 311).* How this is met by the ægis being held in the left only, while the right arm droops vacant and unmeaning in nearly a straight line, it is difficult to see. There is an obvious connexion, however, between the statue and the statuette. But for the former, or some analogue of it, the latter would never have existed. An artist incapable of originality seized on the *pose* of the Belvidere, distorted it to suit his own capacity, and conveyed into it a totally different motive and attribute, somewhat like the divine,

' Who took his discourse from the famed Dr. Browne,
But preached it so vilely he made it his own.'

One may hope to see further editions of the great work before us, in some one of which Herr Overbeck will live to 'despise his dream' of correcting the Belvidere by this statuette, and relegate the latter, with the 'Otricoli bust' of Zeus, to the museum of oblivion.

Before passing on to the other works on our list, a general question may be propounded to the pundits of

* One might add that the epithets *χρυσάορον*, of Apollo, v. 256, and *θυσσανόεσσαν*, of the ægis itself, v. 229, are totally missed. If the right hand had held the 'golden sword,' then the ægis in the left might be duly explained. Further, the expression on the features of the Apollo Belvidere has been generally read as one of scornful resentment—rather of an insult than of an injury. Possibly the plague-arrows shot at the Greeks in *Iliad* i. 48 foll., where the insult is to his priest Chryses, may have suggested the motive, although the Homeric attitude is sedentary, *ἔζετ' ἔπειτ' ἀπάνευθε νεῶν*, κ.τ.λ. But enhanced dignity of *pose* might account for this deviation.

archæology—why is the male and female standard of size and height so singularly the same in ancient statuary? * Take the maidens and youths in the Parthenon frieze; take the Niobe group with its male and female components; take, above all, that of Orestes and Electra from the Neapolitan Museum—three examples of as many different periods—all showing the same absence of due proportion of male to female. The last-named seems indeed as if designed to illustrate that equality of dimension as between the foot of the brother and sister, on which the Æschylean ‘recognition’ dwelt, and which Euripides marked for ridicule.† In the Amazonian friezes one might expect this, as effective for the immediate purpose. Perhaps, as between god and goddess, one might, on mythic grounds of fabled prowess, allow the same. But *why* the Amazonian type should rule Greek womanhood in statuary, is what seems unexplained as yet, alike on grounds of ‘idealismus’ and of ‘naturalismus’—to say nothing of ‘realismus’—on all of which our experts are diffuse. Will Herr Overbeck in his next edition devote a page or two to the subject?

The influence of Greek art on the survival of Paganism in its long struggle with Christianity, and on its partial revival under Julian, is an interesting question which we can now indicate only. The great statues of the Pheidias Zeus and Athene Parthenos are believed to have survived down to the middle of the fifth century A.D., or later. The grandly spiritual conceptions which they idealised in human form must have had a distinctly rallying power on the minds of their votaries, and have long inspired the defence of the ‘temples made with hands’ and the deities ‘graven by art and man’s device.’ But this leads us naturally to the next name on our list.

In no passage of his lectures does Herr Waldstein shine more than in his comment on the chryselephantine statuary and his unfolding of the subjective reasons which mar its acceptance by modern canons of taste. The results of the economic struggle stamped on the life of our period react unfavourably on our artistic temperament. Gold and ivory

* One may add in mediæval art also, e.g. as shown in the paired effigies of knight and lady recumbent on a tomb, In nearly all such there is no adequate sexual difference of dimension.

† See Æschyl. Choëph. 200 foll., and compare Eurip. Elect. 536–7, the latter ending ἀλλ’ ἀρσεν κραεῖ—exactly what our statuaries will not allow.

draw our sympathies from their harmonies of form and hue to their base matter, as in Milton's 'Heaven' the eyes of Mammon were ever fixed upon the golden floor. Further, we associate metallic adjuncts and decorated surface with cheap tawdriness of work. In short, we read our tinsel and shoddy experiences into high art—or, as Mr. Arnold might now put it, we are 'Philistines.' Further yet, we see in composite material an effort of constructiveness, and a sense of the process overpowers the results. But the raptures of the old world critics seem to show no consciousness of any such drawbacks. For them, contrariwise, the grandeur of the design asserted itself so as to overpower any sense of *technique*, as also of material. It was a triumph of spirit over matter, the more perfect because it compelled matter to be its sympathetic vehicle, and did not extinguish, but made it tributary. Mr. F. C. Penrose, whose tasteful researches among the choicest Attic shrines were liberally subsidised by the Dilettanti Society, to be further mentioned, has his theory of the artistic atmosphere of the Parthenon. In his view the hard, frosty glare of the Pentelic masses of its interior was subdued by a lithotint to a sort of moonlight tone, and the environment thus attuned to the softer lustre of the ivory which it enshrined. Mr. Ferguson has made a model of the Parthenon with the figure of Athene therein, lighted from above. 'The light which is thrown upon the statue is most perfect. It falls chiefly upon the face, neck, and arms (the ivory parts), and leaves the golden drapery in a softer half-light.' Thus we reach a progressive harmony in the tinted marble, the ivory, and the gold, which might be raised to any power of expressiveness by the introduction of colour. It is the prerogative of genius to work the grandest effects by the simplest means.

It would be unjust to Herr Waldstein to omit mention of two profoundly interesting retrievals by which two works of the foremost rank have recovered from the worst losses caused by time's havoc. The modesty which leads him to make the least of his personality in the matter, and to magnify his 'method,' sits as naturally on him as the petasus on a Hermes. Far be it from us to disparage the method; but it is plain that Herr Waldstein brought to it that instinct of a trained eye which becomes a divination. He sees in a wall-case of the Louvre a marble head as completely severed as though it had adorned Temple Bar in the last century. He is struck with its Pheidias modelling and

its Parthenonic character. He, in fact, says, 'that is the 'head of a Lapith belonging to one of the metopes.' Indeed the head proclaims itself as part of a mural piece, the left side of it being its wall side, the left ear having no trace, and the right side having suffered most, showing that the left was protected. He ascertains that it had been found in the water at the Piræus. He obtains an exact cast of it from Paris, takes that to the British Museum, and plants it on a broken neck in one of the metopes, which it fits exactly. The nose is broken still, but there we have restored the original head of the finest of all the metopes there, so says Mr. Newton, till lately the eminent curator of the antiquities in the British Museum. The corresponding head of the Centaur, whom the Lapith is throttling, had been previously found at Athens. Thus this grand piece is now in its most essential features virtually complete.*

Again, the same Louvre Museum yields a terra-cotta plaque, which fascinates him by its Pheidias features. He makes a hasty sketch on the spot, receives later a cast from the plaque, compares both with the Athene from the Parthenon frieze, and finds that he has now restored the lovely features of the goddess, whose head had, by the mutilations of time, been reduced in the original to the shapelessness of a barber's block. The question remains, what is the artistic relation of the head on the plaque (Plate IX.) to the figure in the frieze (Plate X.)? Dr. Waldstein seems to establish, by exhaustive enumeration of all other possible suppositions, that it is that of the original working model (*proplasma*) to the finished work. The suppositions which he examines and rejects are: (1) That it is a modern forgery. (2) That it is an ancient copy from the figure in Athens, ordered by some noble Roman of artistic tastes. . . . (3) That it is a work contemporaneous with the frieze. The last possibility includes the supposition that it is one of the original sketches by Pheidias, from which the marble frieze was enlarged and finished. We think him conclusive in his rejection of (1) and (2). But do not the ages intervening between the dates supposed in (2) and (3) open other intervening possibilities? Speaking

* We learn from Professor Michaelis' 'List of Chatsworth Marbles,' p. 277, that No. 5 in that collection, being another head of a Lapith, was in 1855 presented by the late Duke of Devonshire to the British Museum. It belongs to the metope No. 16, which thus stands restored.

in Essay IX. on the intimate relation which some of the Attic sepulchral reliefs, and especially those of the fifth century B.C., hold to the works of Pheidias, after comparing them with others which preceded and followed his, Dr. Waldstein says (p. 304): ‘ If, finally, we compare them with ‘ the Parthenon frieze, the striking correspondence becomes ‘ so evident that we need but place them side by side to ‘ discover that of all Greek works the Parthenon sculptures ‘ are those to which they are most closely related.’ This, then, implies a careful study of the Parthenon sculptures by the relief artists of the fifth, and why not of the following centuries? How could this have been carried on without the intervention of such terra-cotta replicas as the Paris plaque? No artist can thoroughly study a frieze forty-five feet above his head. But if the *proplasmata* of Pheidias had been preserved, endless replicas of them might have been made, and the *ateliers* of Athens might have been full of them. The question, therefore, seems to be by no means foreclosed by the rejection of hypotheses (1) and (2). Therefore, whether the Louvre plaque is the original rough sketch of Pheidias’ own hand, or a copy once or many times removed, is a question which we may leave to the verdict of experts with Herr Waldstein’s theory now fairly before them. But he is quite justified in concluding: ‘ Whether ‘ original or copy, the fact remains that we have here to deal ‘ with an antique representation of the Athene of the ‘ Parthenon frieze, so far as extant, in excellent preservation, ‘ presenting us with the head which is destroyed in the ‘ original marble.’

By a further access of good fortune the trick of art is trumped, as we may say, by yet another similar plaque from the Museo Kircheriano at Rome (Plate XIII.), like the Parisian, a fragment only, but closely agreeing with the former, although on a different scale. It gives the lower part of the seated figure of Athene and the companion figure of Hephæstus, with whom she is in amicable conversation, such as Aspasia might have held with Pericles, recalling the duality of these deities, as the early authors of Greek art, in the Homeric conception of the artist,—

ὄν Ἥφαιστος δέδαεν καὶ Πάλλας Ἀθήνη.

But when we compare this with Plate X. from the frieze itself we are struck with a deviation. The foot of Athene in the latter is supported on a remarkably thick sole or *κρηπίς*, and the lowest line of the drapery which reveals it

is nearly horizontal ; in the former the sole is wholly absent, the foot being planted on the base-level itself, and the line of drapery curves upward from heel to instep in the profile of the foot. The Kircheriano plaque seems therefore to be a modified copy, and this, so far, tends to enlarge the probability that the Parisian plaque may be a copy too.

Yet another distinct piece of good fortune has followed recently the Parthenon frieze. Plate XII. gives from that frieze a group of 'Boy and Priest,' between whom is held a large square of folded cloth. The older opinion was that the boy was handing the sacred peplos to the priest for presentation at Athene's shrine. But this was a conjecture snatched from limited knowledge. The attitudes are against it, which designate the boy as the recipient; and modern critics now see in it the priest uncloaking, to commence the sacrifice, from whom the boy, as an acolyte, receives his upper garment folded. But what we are now concerned to note is that a third terra-cotta has turned up at Copenhagen (Plate XI.), in which the head and pleasing features of the boy, as well as the modelling of his fingers grasping the robe, and the well-defined folds of the latter, are faithfully rendered, whereas in the frieze, as we have it, all this has yielded to time. Not only so, but the Paris plaque and this from Copenhagen are judged to be the veritable opposite extremities of two consecutive slabs, whether models or copies of the work of Pheidias. The mercantile pedigree of both fragments is traced to Italy, whence the same purveyor probably sold each separately—one to a French collector, the other to a Danish artist. The net result gives us a hopeful estimate of the solidarity of art interests and of the brotherhood among their leading students, as also a prospect that further reconciliations may be effected and greater unities restored by the collation of existing stores and future discoveries.

Probably the most adventurous of the identifications proposed by Dr. Waldstein is that of two female headless figures in the eastern pediment of the Parthenon, as 'Thalassa and Gaia' (Sea and Land). He argues the doubtful question very fairly from the personifications of nature common in Greek literature, from those represented in extant and non-extant works of ancient art, among which those of mountains and rivers are conspicuous, as the 'Olympus' and 'Cephisus' of these same pediments, known as 'Theseus' and 'Ilissus' to the art critics of half a century ago. This eastern pediment he regards, with seeming

justice, as 'cosmical;' the western, on the contrary, as 'local.' This is of course a presumption in favour of such cosmical personages as he sees in this pair, being introduced. Similarly, he urges, Sea and Land appear on the relief of the fall of Phaëton, and on that of the myth of Prometheus. Plate VIII. gives an exact view of the remnants of the dual group in question. Gaia, in his view, is the sitting, Thalassa the recumbent figure, resting her shoulders against the bosom of the former, who stoops slightly forward over her, so that their heads would be in juxtaposition—a pose certainly effective for his conception. Turning to the internal evidence of texture and drapery, he criticises it as follows:—

'The nature of the reclining attitude, the junction of the limbs, and even the texture of the nude, indicate a greater flaccidity than is to be found in the other statues. But when, further, we examine the drapery in regard to the lines of the folds, . . . we have in this reclining figure complex masses that intertwine restlessly, and even in the larger folds present a series of curves in various directions. . . . But this peculiarly restless, surging, and fluent quality of the drapery is chiefly manifest in the abundance of the smaller lines and folds and their treatment. . . . In this figure they appear to glide over the breast and ripple over the limbs in small undulations, which suggest the fluid.'

In short, the drapery represents to him that ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα which Æschylus introduces in his grand panorama of the Caucasus as the characteristic feature of the sea. Whether this view is fanciful or graphically true, we must leave to experts to decide. It seems to us to have sufficient presumption in its favour to entitle it to respectful consideration. Its connexion, moreover, with the adjacent figures of the same pediment as regarded by Dr. Waldstein increases the presumption. A third female figure close behind this pair was, by earlier critics, grouped with them as a triad of 'the three Fates,' or the like. Dr. Waldstein regards this as personifying Hestia, 'the human hearth,' to whom, and then to the Earth and the Sea, the god Hermes brings the news of the wondrous birth of Athene—the subject of this whole pediment. This seems to harmonise this wing of the whole composition, but of course it opens other questions of detail, on which we now have not space to dwell. We may here add that a fine fragment of a seated figure (Plate V.) in the Ducal collection at Venice is reclaimed by Dr. Waldstein for the *western* pediment.

Of the reprinted essays which form the appendix to the
VOL. CXLIV. NO. CCCXXVI. K K

volume, the most interesting is that which traces 'the influence of athletic games upon Greek art,' in which the writer says (p. 397):—'Of all causes which led the conventional early artist to nature, by far the most effective was the influence of the athletic games and the palaestra. . . . The palaestra led Greek artists to nature, and secondly . . . away from nature to the ideal—or, rather, through nature to the ideal.'

He further notes that in Greek sculpture the true expression of male form matured earlier than that of female, and that of the male body earlier than that of the head. Both these he ascribes to the study of the nude in athletes. The second, however, would seem to be on general grounds inevitable, the subtle complexity of feature and expression outrunning the feeble resources of early art. The degradation of sculpture is noted as keeping pace with the degradation of the palaestra, shown in the former by the divine conception passing into the sensuous, and this into the sensual; in the latter by the development of professional athletes, the mere means thus becoming an end. But both are only a parallel to the moral degeneracy of Greece so rapidly following her political decline, as she passes recessively from the grand Attic period to the Spartan, the Theban, the Macedonian, and the Asiatic.

Dr. Waldstein's English style is somewhat cumbrous, of which quality our quotations give no adequate sample, the luxuriance of intermediate clauses being often pruned. We do not often, but we do here and there encounter a sentence heavy-gaited and massive, of true Teutonic mould, which seems as if the structure of a mountain range with slope and counterslope and a whole Siebengebirge of subordinate clauses had been its model.* Professor Michaelis has found a most apt translator in Mr. Fennell. It is seldom that a translation reads so like an original and shows so little of the chrysalis form as his work. In Dr. Waldstein the English comes in a quasi-German vehicle; in the Michaelis-Fennell work the German has taken the conditions of English.

These essays on the highest development of Greek sculpture lead on naturally to a review of those examples of it

* In a single sentence of Herr Overbeck's (vol. i. p. 257, 3rd ed.) we have counted 175 words before a period is permitted—equal to over a third of one of our own pages! In it he corrects 'eine irrigte Ansicht.'

which are within reach of our countrymen, such as forms the subject of Professor Michaelis' book.

In all wealthy countries, and notably in our own, the hypocrisy of fashion has ever mingled with the enthusiasm for art, and led many who only cared to fill a large space in the public eye to amass treasures which they neither understood nor cared for. With the motives, however, which may have guided individuals we are only so far concerned as they tend to influence the result. And while not a few collections of princely rank, as they would be deemed abroad, have been dispersed by the fluctuations of taste, the dissipation of fortunes, or other casualties of private and family history, there yet remain representative houses not a few which vindicate the taste and judgement exercised in ennobling them with the wealth of genius rescued from the wreck of time. Professor Michaelis has compiled not of course exhaustive, but representative and effective, catalogues of the principal private collections of monumental art in Great Britain. He has included the public galleries of the two older universities, but, 'for obvious reasons,' has omitted the British Museum. The work is mainly the result of personal research of a laborious and tedious character, as explained in the following warm-hearted sentences from the preface:—

'Favourable circumstances having enabled me to become acquainted with those galleries to a greater extent than any other living archaeologist, I thought it my duty, putting aside for some years other tasks of a more inviting nature, to undertake the irksome, mosaic-like work of drawing up a descriptive catalogue of the marbles they contain. In doing this I hoped also to pay a small tribute of affection and gratitude to a country in which I have seen and learnt much, and have formed many valuable and pleasant personal connexions, and experienced much kindness and hospitality.'

The author admits the existence of minor collections which he was unable to visit, hopes that the defective points in his work may be supplemented by others, and acknowledges his obligations to various friends whose observations and memoranda have assisted his own. He has made free use also of existing catalogues and notices in the various works which have appeared upon the subject. These, however, appear to have been so eclectic, fragmentary, isolated, and sporadic in their character and contents, as only to afford a precarious help. The work, as must happen with one of such character, was slow in its progress through the press, during which sources and aids came to light which had not

been available or perhaps existent in its earlier stages, thus causing some lack of coherency in its details. The indexes show not only the collections examined and their sources, but a list of known drawings of ancient sculpture, likely to be specially valuable to art students. The work is edited for the syndics of the Cambridge University Press.

The author distinguishes three chief periods of acquisitiveness, since the time when the exhumed stores of olden Italy and Greece first drew the attention of Englishmen. The first is the early Stuart period, on which a faint mark is left by Henry, Prince of Wales, who predeceased his father in 1612. The second nearly coincides with the formation and most flourishing period of the Dilettanti Society, adorned by many names historical, political, and literary, as we shall further see. The third is that in which the efforts of the nation outstride those of individual or socially united collectors, and the British Museum becomes the treasure house of the ages for all the world. We can only dwell on a few of the more prominent personages, and of the more typical discoveries or purchases in each of these. It may be noted by the way that researches in Greece proper and the once Grecised shores of the Levant and Archipelago, even when attempted, hardly bear fruit until late in the second period, and remain quite secondary in importance down to the commencement of the third. Paintings, save some decayed traces of their mural form, and half-vanished touches of pigment upon statuary and architecture, are excluded from our present view by the nature of the case; while we can hardly afford more than a side glance now and then at gems, cameos, coins, 'and such 'small deer,' although their pursuit has furnished a career, and their possession a celebrity—in *tenui labor*, at *tenuis non gloria*—to many votaries of the curious past. By reason of its solidity and permanent quality, sculpture, especially when combined with and sheltered by architecture, mostly needs some ruder violence than the touch of time and stress of weather to destroy it; and this makes it the true backbone of historical art. Since and before Verres acquired infamy by his loot of Sicily, the Roman republican nobles had imbibed the relish for Greek art. They passed it on to the Empire, which in turn bequeathed it—a sealed legacy with probate postponed—to the Roman Church. Rome had become the grave of her own former magnificence, and every famous site of palace or villa a catacomb of its interred remains. The Renaissance in its direct artistic influence seems to have left

England untouched. Felt at once in the schools, and soon in all the channels of literature, it only became pronounced in architecture and the arts a full century later; like the tide wave which only strikes our shores when the moon has outrun its due incidence.

As regards then the early Stuart period, the early lost son of James I. has been named already; but some coins, together with fourteen Florentine bronze statues of doubtful character, were all that his premature death enabled him to leave. The pioneer of that research which goes afield in quest of its object, and sojourns on foreign soil in order to break it for hidden treasures, was Thomas, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, Earl Marshal of the kingdom in 1612–14. We read that he not only employed agents in various countries of promise for his purpose, but ‘obtained leave to institute excavations on the sites of ruins about Rome, and it is also related that he discovered in subterraneous chambers a whole number at a time of splendid Roman portrait-statues.’ Among the travellers in his suite was Inigo Jones, who there imbibed the taste which in the latter half of the seventeenth century he stamped on English architecture. Using first the influence of Sir T. Roe, then ambassador from England to the Grand Turk, and then the trained skill and great personal energy of a Mr. W. Petty,* he endeavoured to sweep Greece as well as Italy into the collector’s net. With the usual fate of such efforts, he encountered even thus early in the field the counter schemes of a most formidable rival, in the person of the then newly raised Duke of Buckingham, first courtier of his time; while of the treasures which he lighted on and longed for, some were too bulky for safe transport; others, although bought and paid for, were impounded by the Papal Government; for others, although he bade lavishly high—as his contemporary and censor, Lord Clarendon, asserts—he could not coax a sale. This attempt to levy contributions upon Greece, among whose coasts and islands Venice still cast a fading shadow, shows a true instinct, although it was almost two centuries before the treasure thus divined was actually secured. ‘The merit of having caused these classic [i.e. Greek] shores to be ransacked for the express purpose of collecting antiques belongs to the Earl of Arundel, and the energy with which

* Not, as we learn from p. 11, note 18, any cadet of what became later the Lansdowne family, although the contrary has often been asserted.

'he followed up this task in the midst of so many others 'quite answers to one of the characteristic qualities of his 'nation.' Such is the impression which prolonged residence and research in England seems to have produced on the mind of Professor Michaelis. The island of Rheneia pointed out by the then Bishop of Andros to Sir T. Roe proved a rich mine to Arundel; nor is the yield, it is said, entirely exhausted yet.

Full soon, however, to Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, 'some demon whispered, Villiers, have a taste.' As premier subject by royal favour, he, too, enlisted with ease the aid of Sir T. Roe, who seems to have had an uneasy time of it, in this 'divided duty' between him and Arundel. But any remissness in Roe's services to the Earl was more than made up by the indefatigable activity of Petty, who swept a wide horizon eastward and southward to Sinope and to Alexandria, and, after narrowly missing to secure* the material fabric of the 'Sublime Porte' itself in the twelve large reliefs adorning the Golden Gate of Theodosius, the grand entrance to Stamboul, threw out feelers to Pergamon, Samos, and the islands, outmanœuvred Roe, lost one large collection together with his passports by shipwreck, fished up the former again from the bottom of the *Ægean*, but was for lack of the latter imprisoned as a spy, obtained new credentials, and secured at Smyrna the famous 'Arundelian' marbles, which have furnished since the foundation stone of Greek chronology to Clinton and Grote. Buckingham found, too, that special agency, which could apply energy and discrimination on the spot, was needed for the prosecution of such efforts with success, and was ready to receive his newly imported opulence of art, when he fell by the dagger of Felton. We hear next of Herbert, Earl of Montgomery and later of Pembroke, of the Countess of Bedford, appearing as collectors, and lastly King Charles I. himself, who gave employment to his admiral Sir Kenelm Digby in 'causing a 'whole army of old forraine emperours, captaines, and senators all at once to land on his coasts, to come and doe him 'homage.' The importations of all these patrons show a

* 'Aurum per medios ire satellites et perrumpere amat saxa' was never more nearly verified; but after the garrison and their commander had been all but won by corruption, superstition turned the scale. The reliefs were regarded as a talisman, and, although of Christian origin, as the *palladium* of the Crescent City. They have since disappeared, and left no traces.

predominance of the Asiatic schools in Greek art, and evince the striving after effect and the learned study of, rather than active sympathy with nature which mark a declining taste. They had, however, until grander sources of more direct inspiration became known, their immediate value; while of course some are still representatively important in the history of art. But to Lord Arundel belongs the higher praise that he not only collected examples, the best which fell in his way, but sought to win appreciation for their teaching power. He 'caused many specimens . . . to be 'drawn or engraved; . . . access to these treasures was to 'all appearance made easy for artists in general. Arundel 'House became in this way a sort of gathering-place for 'scholars and friends of art.' He threw the old currency of ancient masters into circulation again, and so raised the modern standard.

In King Charles's purchases less fine discernment seems to have been exercised. He procured a *levée en masse* of statuary, as he might have raised a regiment of guards. They were old and new promiscuously, not a few of them by 'prentice-hands of insular artists, made 'to order' for the adornment of St. James's, Whitehall, or Greenwich. There they broke horizontal lines of terrace, or filled niches, alcoves, and corridors, as books often fill shelves by way of contrast to the upholstery, and were perhaps bought by the gallery, at a lump price, as the latter sometimes are for the library.

In the midst of these pursuits of cultured peace broke upon the royal and noble *virtuosi* the clash of civil discord in the Great Rebellion. Before this check, however, was given to his zeal, we find Lord Arundel assisting Cardinal Richelieu to 'buy a whole palace,' antiques and all, in Rome, and 'giving him information as to about eighty busts in different 'parts of Italy.' The King of France took over the Palais Cardinal on Richelieu's death; but his successor, Cardinal Mazarin, took over his sculptures. Other purchases swelled this collection to about four hundred statues and busts. The ages seemed all giving up their wealth at once, and critical discernment was rarer even than length of purse. Thus pieces which would now be ranked as poor or mediocre, with a sprinkling of real high art and a long train probably of modern make-believes—nay, still worse, with genuine antiques reset and mounted in carved draperies of costly modern marble—crowded the *salons* and filled the niches which made the Cardinal's abode the *merveille de la France*, the centre of fashionable, although ignorant, enthusiasm. Here, too,

armed strife came to interrupt and scatter for awhile. In the year of the Fronde, 1652, Mazarin had to seek an asylum beyond the frontier, and his treasures were in part dispersed by sale. But before long he returned flushed with the new prestige of his enemies' triumph reversed, and the scattered pieces were restored to him. On his death in 1661 these accumulations passed to a niece and nephew. The husband of the former, we are told,

'a rough and half-crazy man, who lived in a perpetual state of quarrel with his wife, took advantage of her absence to enter the gallery one fine morning armed with a large hammer, and to belabour the undressed statues in a fit of pretended prudery. Not content with this, and regardless of all remonstrance, he returned in the evening with five or six attendants all armed in like fashion, and carried on his crackbrained work of destruction till midnight. . . . The scandalous event made the greatest sensation in Paris. However, the misfortune had occurred and could not be undone. It was not in the least lessened, but only relegated to the region of the comic, by the nude statues being "froked" in a sort of drapery of plaster of Paris, just as the Pope's sense of decency a hundred years later enveloped the Aphrodite of Knidos in a cloak of tin.'

In this their attitude of 'penance in a white sheet,' the statues were still visible to an English traveller at the close of the century. Early in the next 'John Law's Bubble Company' took over the palace as its 'show-place,' at which time, probably, the then Earl of Pembroke bought many of its busts with their variegated appendages; and some of the pieces of statuary in the Wilton House collection still bear evidence of their Mazarin pedigree 'in the hammer-marks with which their nude parts are disfigured.'

The Earl of Arundel had found in the contemporary Earl of Pembroke a rival whom he viewed as formidable, but the chief founder of the glories of Wilton House was the eighth Earl (succ. 1683). He purchased a residue of the Arundel collection, chiefly busts, which were fondly believed or imagined to be always those of the greater men of the grander periods. As the humours of the historic imagination varied in this or that collector, he selected arbitrarily his company from the ages past, with much the same freedom as he invited his dinner parties in the present. Thus, when transferred from the Mazarin collection or the Arundel to the Pembroke or the Burlington, a *soi-disant* bust of 'Pericles' would be reticketed as 'Demosthenes' or 'Marius,'

or reappear as 'Alexander the Great.' Heroes and patriots descended to the level of Shakespeare's Caliban, 'Get a new master; be a new man.' The most notorious offender in this arbitrary masquerade was the 'Cardinal Alessandro Albani, who could not bear a bust to be nameless'—somewhat as Lord Byron 'hated anonymous wine'—and often affixed to his favourites the grandest pseudonyms on the flimsiest pretences, which led Winckelmann to call him that 'audacious priest.'

The first collection seized, sold, and dispersed by the Long Parliament was the late Duke of Buckingham's, the next was the King's, which naturally fell into a branch of the public revenue. The inventory of the latter is dated some two months after his execution, and proof is said to exist that a Tiberius fetched 500*l.*, and a Silenus 600*l.* Mazarin bought many statues, and Christina of Sweden 'the choice of all the medals and jewels.' There was a reservation made by the Parliament in favour of statues of more conspicuous merit, and 'Cromwell exerted himself more than any one, though not always with success, to prevent a barbarous squandering of art treasures.' He even 'prevented the delivery to the purchasers' of some that were sold; and these, retained about him at Whitehall, his later favourite residence, became after the Restoration the nucleus of a new Royal collection. This continued to grow by new purchases and the rescue of old possessions until January 1698, when the whole of Whitehall Palace, except the Banquet Hall, perished with all its contents, save an inconsiderable salvage, by fire. The treasures of the Stuarts' taste did not long survive their fall.

No such sweeping catastrophe, but a long series of ignoble calamities, overtook the Arundel collection, reflecting all the vicissitudes of a great family in troublous times. Divisions of inheritance, family quarrels, sales by auction, one such by order of Parliament, and all the rough usage which a time of turmoil brings to frail beauties deprived of their natural protector, had been their portion before the Restoration. Then the restored heir wrecked the collection by criminal neglect. Pieces of rare merit and irreparable value lay about to canker in the damp alleys of a London garden or corrode their surfaces in the air, and a large slab of the Parian Tables was picked out from a chimney of the palace. Happily, Evelyn and Selden came to the rescue, and obtained from the utterly indifferent owner a gift of the books to the Royal Society, then in its first decade, and a presentation of the

marbles and inscribed stones to the Ashmolean and other museums at Oxford. There within living memory a number of them remained crowded together in an unused 'Schola,' probably that of Music, in a corner of the Schools' quadrangle, with that helpless, chaotic look which a mob of statuary always wears, and some 'must to this day (1881) be sought 'in a damp basement room of the Ashmolean Museum.' The history of the residue is more painful still: it is that of a persecuted remnant. The Earldom of Arundel had become a Dukedom of Norfolk, but as the Howards rose in the peerage they declined at this period (1678-91) in taste. Norfolk House was built fronting the river, and Norfolk Street, Surrey Street, and Arundel Street ran up from its sloping flank towards the Strand. The contemporary Earl of Pembroke became a large purchaser of some pieces, others were sheltered under a colonnade in the garden of the rebuilt mansion, along the flank of which house property ran a barrier wall. Over this the workmen erecting the new street-houses flung their rubbish, till beneath its mass the colonnade was crushed, and many of the statues perished in the fall of their asylum. Some were then bought by Lord Lempster for his Northamptonshire seat, others went, in the decline of the house's fortunes, to an old servant, as embellishment of a suburban pleasure-ground. There were still some left, which the reigning Duke employed on the Southwark side as the foundation of a rampart against the Thames. Thence they were again dug up, and six entire colossal figures, headless and armless by this time, recovered, probably to perish in a great fire at the ducal residence at Worksop, while a drum of a pillar came to be the roller of a bowling green. The coins and medals, more transportable, were more easily kept together, and after various changes of hands became 'the nucleus of the famous Marlborough gems.' But some of the statues had, at a later period, to endure modern insult, added to injury of time, in the form of tasteless restoration by 'a shallow butcher,' one 'Guelfi, whom Lord Burlington 'had brought over, . . . to do the work.' The work was done, but many of the broken torsos, deemed unworthy of it, stood in the Burlington conservatory in 1736, which was crammed like the shop of a statuary, and where Horace Walpole shot his paper pellets of wit at 'Tully haranguing 'a numerous assembly of decayed emperors, vestal virgins 'with new noses.' Of these early collectors' stores we can only notice one more, and that because it has found

refuge from dispersion under the nation's wing. The Sloane antiques were a cornerstone of the collections in the British Museum. Indeed, with the Harleian MSS. and the Cottonian Library, they became the nucleus of that national treasure. Sir Hans Sloane received and increased a museum of miscellaneous curiosities from William Courten. It consisted of miniatures, drawings, shells, and other natural or artificial rarities. Antiquities from the old world and the new were added by Sloane, who 'filled' therewith 'several 'groundfloor rooms of his house in Chelsea,' and at his death the State bought the whole for 20,000*l*.

In the eighteenth century 'the grand tour' became the fashionable finish of high education. Englishmen who encountered one another abroad found Rome the emporium of tasteful society, and sought to transplant to their home some of the charms, artistic and social, which had made Rome so attractive. A nation of sportsmen enjoyed the still well-stocked preserves of antiques which Rome in the eighteenth century contained, while the Romans gradually formed an opinion of their visitors' wealth which made them anxious to beat the covers for these insular customers. Much of the general excitement of pursuit mingled thus with appreciative taste for classical beauties, and those who cared little for the object yet fell into the study and adorned their country houses with the results, much as Sir Roger de Coverley garnished his kennel doors with the trophied noses of the foxes he had killed in chase. This led to the formation of the Dilettanti Society in 1733-34, a project which was furthered by the impulse then lately given to such tastes by Sir A. Fountaine, the Earl of Burlington, Mr. Coke (afterwards Earl of Leicester), the second Earl of Bessborough, the third Duke of Marlborough, and the fourth Earl of Carlisle. To have visited Italy was a needful qualification for the Dilettanti, and most of its leading members had not only travelled thither but resided and collected there. Among them are many names of high distinction in other walks of influence, social, political, and literary.* The friendly and social intercourse thus engendered hung

* Such as Mr. E. Wortley Montague, Lord Anson, 1750, Conyers Middleton, Dr. Mead, Fox Lord Holland, Sir W. Hamilton, Mr. Payne-Knight, North Lord Guilford, Mr. Samuel Rogers, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, Hobhouse Lord Broughton, and Lord Houghton, the later names bringing us down to recent memory. A much longer list, although still only a selection, is given by Professor Michaelis, p. 64, note 161.

its festive lightness round the more staid academical pursuit professed, which in turn gave a redeeming elevation to those coarse and bibulous instincts to which English society in that century tended. The splendid succession of publications on the subject of Greek and Roman antiquities which this society liberally befriended comes in for high praise.* 'All these volumes,' says our professor, after enumerating some of the chief, 'command similar respect on the score of irrefragable trustworthiness in reporting facts and in pursuit of truth. Excellent as is their outward form, yet no sacrifice has ever been made to external display, to the detriment of unconditional material reliability. In this respect the publications of the society are unequalled.' It was now that something like the Cinque-cento revival reached England. The age sank low in politics, lower in religious instincts, while under the stimulus of machinery merely mechanical handicrafts were engrossing a larger and larger percentage of our national resources and energy. It was well that this counteracting attraction put forth its force just then. There was at once room for it, and need of it to an extent which has hardly existed before or since. It was better even for the toppers that they should muddle their brains under the influence of this clarifying restorative than without it. Golden opportunities were also opening just then in Italy itself. We read that

'Great collections had been made in Rome in the seventeenth century by the princes and cardinal-nephews, the Barberini, Borghese, Giustiniani, Ludovici, Odescalchi, Pamfili, Rospigliosi, and others. This high tide in the native love of art was, however, followed at the beginning of the eighteenth century by an equally significant ebb, caused by the increasing pecuniary embarrassment of the noble families of Rome.'

The sales of entire collections were effected in a few years. But their price seems to have hardly been affected by the rapidity with which they were thrown upon the market, such was the ready eagerness of foreign wealth to compete. To check the efflux from Italy of her chief attraction, the Popes, besides becoming considerable purchasers, founded the Capitoline Museum, an organisation, as it were, of patriotic defence against the organised attack of the English Dilet-

* Horace Walpole of course has a sneer for this as for most things: 'A Club, for which the formal qualification is having been in Italy, and the real one, being drunk,' is his description of the society to Mann. (Letter of April 14, 1743.)

tanti. 'The result was that a splendid treasure was secured 'to Rome.' To meet the still raging demand abroad, the Romans began briskly to manufacture antiques, besides setting up various modes of trimming, patching, and vamping up for the market mere fragments unsaleable otherwise, the *chiffonnerie* of art. Then rose to fame Cavaceppi, who raised restoration to a fine art of itself with a quasi-scientific basis, somewhat as modern practitioners touch up an old hat.

'Through several decades all the most important finds and purchases passed through Cavaceppi's hands, and were made to submit to his rejuvenating arts. . . . No one, or at least very few, would have bought the broken torso and limbs as they came from the ground. Besides, from the days of the Renaissance restorations had been considered a matter of course * . . . and even so fine a connoisseur as Cardinal Albani carried on the business with such enthusiasm that he gained the title of "réparateur en chef de l'antiquité." The Elgin Marbles were the first to break the spell. Canova protested that it would be a sacrilege for a modern hand to complete these fragments.'

Then rose to fame Gavin Hamilton, a Scot, and Thomas Jenkins, an Englishman, as agents in chief for the purchase of all that Italy could supply in the antique line; although the fame of the latter is somewhat spotted with doubtful transactions. C. Townley, who became a Dilettante later, employed this Jenkins to dig, but got news which induced him to drop in upon him one day unannounced from England in the Corso. The news was that a statue or fragment of great price had been found by Jenkins. Jenkins, as stated by Dalloway ('Anecdotes of Painting,' p. 727), received his patron with an air of straightforward liberality, divided all the rest handsomely between them, but secreted the principal piece.† Jenkins seems to have added to his other qualifications for imposture that of being an excellent actor. He was the Joseph Surface of art pioneers. He would pull

* Hamilton (of whom below) declared that Lord Tavistock would not give a guinea for the finest torso ever found. Often a broken statue, if the head was entire, would fetch a high price mounted as a bust. Statues in round were sawn into relief pieces and fixed on slabs, or, more adventurously, reliefs would be raised and completed into the round.

† Our author casts doubt on the truth of this, but Dalloway published it while Townley was still alive, from whom he no doubt had it, and Jenkins was only lately dead. The practice of Jenkins in keeping a regular *atelier* in the Colosseum for the forgery of antiques, and his double-dealing and chicane, recorded on pp. 78-79, 452 and 530, make any scruples about accepting the story superfluous.

out his pocket-handkerchief at parting with a favourite gem or statue, and testify such profound emotion as to show that the solid consolation which he required for the sacrifice must be proportionably high. Hamilton seems to have been gifted with an eye at once to art and profit; but although 'his love for old sculpture was not purely platonic,' he scorned the petty rascalities and big swindles to which Jenkins stooped. Thus differing in moral standard the two men worked together, and amassed a knowledge of men and local conditions which enabled them sometimes to buy cheaply a whole collection at a swoop. Obtaining leave to dig on the famous Tivoli site of Adrian's Villa, Hamilton, after diverting a lake, raked in the slime, and fished up thence a single catch of sixty marbles, excellently preserved by nature's oozy packing. Such were the chances which awaited the adventurer's spade in 1770. Such finds as these sharpened the appetite of our native magnates; but even the lavish prices which they offered could not always obtain the extradition of the objects. Yet Cavaceppi's record, still extant, shows that a great part of his work went to England. True, the note 'to be found in England' stands against many pieces which cannot now be found, dispersed probably by sale into holes and corners and passed from hand to hand. Pecuniary straits or tempting offers, moreover, drew from time to time the stores amassed by English collectors to other shores.* The reigning *furor* was shared by King George III.; other crowned heads followed suit on a smaller scale; the Popes themselves turned collectors and added a museum wing for marbles to the Vatican Palace. But foremost in competition in the later decades of the century stands an Englishman, C. Townley, mentioned above as employing Hamilton and Jenkins. He backed their efforts with ample means and ready but discerning zeal, being himself now a veteran at the trade of acquisition. He exchanged Rome, with, however, subsequent revisitations, for London in 1776. In 1786 he joined the Dilettanti. His house in Park Street became what the Palais Mazarin had been to Paris in the middle of the previous century. Here a company worshipful, learned, and artistic would gather, especially at his Sunday dinners. Charles Greville and Sir W. Hamilton, Payne-Knight and Hancarville, Blundell and Smith-Barry shared

* Thus the Empress Catherine II. bought for 30,000*l.* Lord Orford's collection, and agreed a few years later to buy that of Mr. Lyde Brown, a great customer of Jenkins.

these symposia, some of the humours of which resemble those coarsely caricatured by Smollett. They are depicted in two of the finest works of Sir Joshua Reynolds, which are still the property of the Dilettanti Society, and are to be seen, with their other pictures, in Willis's Rooms, St. James. Hancarville was the mystagogue of antique art, evolving 'cloud-capt towers and gorgeous palaces' of theory as groundless as those of Prospero's vision, patronised, if not frequently propounded, by Townley, but sometimes keenly quizzed by the harder common-sense of Blundell. Townley loved collection, lived for it, worked for it, reposed in it. In him the glories of the Dilettanti, social and artistic, culminated; while the name of Payne-Knight, who evolved from the teachings of Bentley at the beginning of the century a digammated Homeric text, reminds us of their literary side, and hands us on to the third epoch, determined by the purchase of the Elgin Marbles by the nation, and their appearance in the British Museum, free alike to the art worshipper and the 'Philistine' scoffer.

Among these last, sad to say, was Payne-Knight found. The controversy was long and stubborn between the old school with its standards and the new, resembling that between the old and new learning at the time of the Reformation. On each occasion Greece was to assert herself. Dodwell, Gell, and Leake had as travellers beaten the ground well, and sagaciously noted sites. The pediment groups of Ægina, and the frieze of the Phigalian Apollo, were unearthed by a party of which C. R. Cockerell, a young English architect, was the most enterprising and resolute member. Lord Elgin, newly appointed ambassador to the Porte, found his research, guided by Sir W. Hamilton with a suite of draughtsmen, impeded by the presence of Bonaparte in Egypt, and his time, money, and perseverance frittered away. The Battle of the Nile and the Defence of Acre changed the difficulties into facilities. In 1803 Lord Elgin was recalled, but two hundred chests full of marbles were now ready packed for transport. The casualties of war and weather made their passage precarious and tedious; and as soon as the first consignment reached London, Payne-Knight pronounced them 'Roman of the time of Hadrian,' and the war of criticism began. Lord Elgin, whose expenses and losses incurred in the acquisition amounted to over 60,000*l.*, was mortified by the storm of depreciation of his trophies, mingled with personal vituperation of himself, in which the Dilettanti on the whole sided with Payne-Knight, and

carried the verdict of aristocratic society against him. Lord Byron joined the chorus of calumny, and circulated privately a satire which had the effect of a poisoned stiletto.* Yet the champions of the marbles showed a strength of no mean weight and of increasing numbers on Lord Elgin's side. From the first, West, President of the Royal Academy, Fuseli, and more powerfully yet in paper warfare, Haydon, had recognised the superlative merit of the new importation.

'For three months he kept copying the originals till he made them quite his own, and thought and dreamt of nothing else. He entreated Lord Elgin to permit young artists to have access to them as much as possible, as they were the true school of art. So enthusiastic a spirit as Haydon, and one so well able to handle the pen, could not fail to come forward as the public champion of persecuted beauty, and harbinger of the new gospel of art.'

With this encouragement Lord Elgin resisted the overtures hinted on behalf of the Musée Napoléon, which obligingly offered his marbles a place amongst the 'loot' of the various European capitals on which the French Emperor had levied blackmail. The Crown Prince of Bavaria, himself an expert, the very director of the Musée Napoléon aforesaid, and lastly Canova, then dictator of European taste in sculpture, were all emphatic and enthusiastic in their encomiums. This last authority, to be sure, threw later the weight of his authority into the scale. The proposal for purchase by the nation had come before the House of Commons just in time to be interrupted by the bulletin announcing Waterloo. This caused an adjournment, during which the reliefs from Phigalia, long delayed, reached England. This fixed public attention more keenly on the debate, and at the same time furnished a standard of judgement by which to decide it. This also gave time for Canova to reach England, who was loud in his regrets that he had not been able to study the marbles when his style was forming. 'Oh that I were a young man,' he said, 'and had to begin again. I should work on totally different principles, . . . and form, I hope, an entirely new school.' Witnesses from all the schools of art were examined by the Committee of the House, only Haydon being excluded 'out of delicacy to Mr. Payne-Knight.' Haydon flamed forth at once in an article on 'Connoisseurs preferred to Artists.' As literary supports, just in time too, came two remarkable prolusions of Visconti before

* The Curse of Minerva. Athens: March, 1811.

the Paris Academy. The scale of judgement in the Committee was effectually turned in Lord Elgin's favour; but the then state of the national finances, exhausted by the long war, caused a necessary niggardliness which left him the loser by nearly half his outlay. Thus was virtually secured the latest triumph of Pheidias, more than twenty-two centuries after his death. The soreness left behind by this long and personally embittered controversy was doubtless aggravated by a remembrance of the unsympathetic reception which, after escapes and adventures, had awaited both himself and his treasures on reaching England. A large portion of his chests had been wrecked and recovered from the bottom of the Ionian Sea, while he had been kidnapped by the French. His own detention was the longer of the two; and meanwhile news of the havoc wrought by his agents had come home, while the firman he had received from the Porte could only by a strain of language be held to cover what were now called his depredations. Amidst prejudice and obloquy thus easily raised against him, a counter-claim even on the part of Mr. Perceval's Government had been ostensibly raised to the actual property in his acquisitions. The mortification arising from these untoward circumstances was probably the reason why it was not until the year 1831—when calumny had subsided and adverse criticism had given place to enthusiasm and rapture, and when Payne-Knight was now seven years dead—that Lord Elgin was elected a member of the Dilettanti Society, without his knowledge, and he politely declined the honour.

The time has gone by when private collections could form more than satellites, provincial or urban, to the great national luminary of the British Museum collection. But among 'the Epigoni' of the Dilettanti Society may be named the late Duke of Hamilton, the late Lord de Mauley, and William, second Earl of Lonsdale, who added two splendid art galleries to Lowther Castle, which he enriched from the Stowe auction in 1848, and made a haven of rest for various erratics from other collections or importations by earlier hands. Nor should we omit mention here of well-timed aid given by the Society to the recovery of antiques, not for their own benefit, as a club of artistic *savants*, but in the national interest. Thus in 1833 they defrayed for the trustees of the British Museum the far larger portion of the purchase-money of the 'Siris' bronzes—remains dug up on a battle-field of King Pyrrhus in Southern Italy—which now stand in the very forefront of ancient plastic art, besides

the cost of engraving them. Indeed, from a much earlier period a noble liberality towards objects as well without as within their own specialty distinguished the Dilettanti, as may be seen from a notice in the pages of this Review for April 1857, p. 508. Not a few, again, of recent Dilettanti have enriched the Museum by gifts and bequests—a feature of generosity which distinguishes the concurrent history of the two institutions throughout their joint course. Besides a sprinkling of gems from individual collectors during a century and a half, and not to mention the older munificent examples of the Lethieullier family, of Townley and Payne-Knight, on which Herr Michaelis has much to say, more recent examples are at hand in the late Earl of Aberdeen, whose collection was made a national heritage by his son and heir in 1861. A miscellaneous voracity of acquisition distinguished Sir William Hamilton, whose collection of vases and other antiques became national property by sale for 8,400*l.* in 1772. Hamilton, whose ambassadorship at Naples gave him a post of vigilance and vantage, continued his favourite pursuit with unsated eagerness and unabated zeal to the close of the century. ‘Tischbein once saw him there, ‘coming from court, in full court dress with stars and orders, ‘carrying a basketful of vases: a ragged lazzarone held one ‘handle of the basket, and the English minister the other.’ The Dukes of Bedford and Buckingham, whose career closed in the same year (1839), enriched each his private collection, the latter to be dissipated nine years later by the Stowe auction. But the part of generous jackal to the British Lion of Bloomsbury was played more lately by Sir William Temple, younger brother of the late Viscount Palmerston, who, again, being ambassador at Naples, formed another collection, which might compare with Hamilton’s of earlier fame. Bronzes, vases, terra-cottas, vessels, and ornaments in glass and gold, coins, and a medley of smaller objects, over fourteen hundred in all, were by him, with his brother’s consent, presented to the nation in 1856. Lord Strangford, ambassador to the Porte (1820–25), bequeathed to the Museum the few fine pieces of sculpture which graced his collection, the rest being given to Canterbury. Mr. James Woodhouse, a merchant prince, to whom a Government post in the Ionian Islands, then our dependency, and a residence at Corfu opened golden chances, would have bestowed their results similarly, but a dispute over his will has left a hiatus between intention and fulfilment. Here and there freaks of personal eccentricity in the collector survive in the collec-

tion, as, for instance, in the Soane Museum, a curiosity of national property, which our country cousins may stumble over in Lincoln's Inn Fields. The travels of Sir C. Fellows in Lycia, and the residence of Mr. Charles Newton in Mitylene, roused the Directors of the British Museum to augment still further their store from the new sources thus opened. The diviner's rod in the explorer's hand was wielded well. Then was recovered from the Lycian Xanthus an entire cycle of illustration for art history from its archaic period to its Roman decadence. From the olden seat of Ionian civilisation round Miletus, and from the neighbourhood of Cnidos were filled 384 chests of pieces, on which alone the renown of any less superbly various collection might have been left to rest. Mr. J. T. Wood was retained at Ephesus, and his resources recruited by the Directors, and the massive tympana of the great Temple of Artemis are now housed in their Museum, while from unimpeachable heathen sources the date of Polycarp has been corrected, and the language of the Book of the Acts copiously confirmed by inscriptional details. From Rhodes and Halicarnassus, Cyprus and remote Cyrene, local and provincial schools have furnished their specimens and yielded their several quotas to the toll imposed by ubiquitous research.

The history of ancient art runs parallel to ancient literature, and touches the latter at all its salient points. To attempt to trace this parallel here would lead us too far from our subject, but as we tell over our treasure-trove of ancient sculpture, which forms the heirloom of education in modern art, a glance may be allowed at the early struggles of mind to stamp on matter its concept of the human form, the rather, inasmuch as the universal tendency of sculpture to find more permanent material for its expression, and the greater durability of marble, bronze, and clay, has impeded due recognition of the earlier wooden statuary which first exercised the artist's tool. The ruder examples preserved to us in marble show sculpture emerging from the 'wooden shoes,' as one may say, which clogged its earlier movements. This is noticeable in the well-known Apollo of Tenea, now in the Glyptothek at Munich, and the Hermes 'Kriophoros'—nude figures—but more especially in the headless Dresden Athene, and the probably still older Artemis of the Neapolitan Museum. The former have many of the attributes of the ordinary wooden doll, while fibrous material influences the character of the two latter chiefly in the draperies, full of stiff lines and zigzag folds, as though the free play of the chisel had

been limited by the grain of the wood. But it has not been duly noticed that the devotional statuary, especially of Doric shrines, continued to be largely of wood down to the post-Pheidian period. Thus Xenophon tells us of a copy in cypress wood of the Ephesian Artemis in a temple on the way from Sparta to Olympia.* Being a copy makes the material more remarkable, since the original seems to have been of gold. And Pausanias, besides a great number of incidental notices of these *ξόανα*, dwells especially on five such as having drawn his attention, of which three were in Crete and Delos, the others in Boeotia.† He, moreover, had seen promiscuous examples sufficiently numerous for him to register six or seven different timbers as those mostly preferred. The more conservative Greek cities would naturally cling most tenaciously to the rude but venerable figures which had received the homage of earlier ages. So we find in Theocritus mention of a statue of Asclepius in cedar-wood.‡ Dry-rot, white ants, and other kindred pests, to say nothing of the warps and fissures caused by time, rendered wood too obviously a 'vesture of decay' to clothe immortal conceptions, and it only did so permanently where something of contempt blending with a grovelling ideal found in clumsiness a fit vehicle of caricature; as when the

Faber incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum
Maluit esse deum.

But from such ungainly blocks—at first rude conventional symbols—the spirit of Greek art subdued the symbolical, and made its way through the natural to the ideal. In that ascendancy that spirit floats sublime without effort, as beyond rival,

Radit iter liquidum celeres neque commovet alas,

and becomes the teaching and informing genius of every following age.

* Anab. v. iii. 12.

† Paus. ix. xl. 3, 4; and viii. xvii. 1, 2; also i. xviii. 5, xxvii. 1; ii. iv. 5; xvii. 5; xix. 3, 6; xxiv. 3; xxv. 1; iii. xv. 10; xvi. 7; xxv. 3; iv. xxxiv. 7; v. xiii. 7; ix. iii. 2; xvi. 3; x. iv. 9. In all these the word *ξόανον* is used, or wooden material mentioned, and probably in other passages where specially ancient statues are recorded as existing the same material is to be understood.

‡ καὶ τὸδ' ἀπ' εὐώδους γλύψατ' ἄγαλμα κέδρον, Epigram. ζ', 4.

ART. VII.—*A History of England from the conclusion of the Great War in 1815.* Vols. IV. and V. By SPENCER WALPOLE, Esq. London: 1886.

THE jubilee year of the reign of Queen Victoria could not be celebrated in a more appropriate manner than by the publication of a careful historical record of the vast and varied events which have occurred in the last half-century. To those who, like ourselves, have lived through these multifarious scenes and have known most of the actors in them, the retrospect is one of singular interest, not unmixed with wonder at the ever-shifting changes of opinion and the prodigious advance of the nation in its social and political condition, due mainly to the triumph of Liberal principles. Men of the younger generations, which have come to life in this long interval, can scarcely realize a state of society so different in many respects from that in which they are born. 'L'histoire d'avant-hier,' said M. Guizot, 'est la moins connue, on peut dire la plus oubliée du public d'aujourd'hui.' Curiously enough, Her Majesty, Mr. Gladstone, and Earl Grey are, we believe, the only living political personages of the first rank who have taken a part in all these occurrences, and whose memory includes them all. Even the humbler surviving spectators of the evolution of this great drama are now few in number.

By a fortunate coincidence Mr. Walpole resumes his narrative, which was suspended six years ago, at a moment when the attention of the public is naturally directed to a retrospect of those interesting and momentous years which will be for ever designated as the Victorian epoch. The third volume of this important work left off at the fall of the Melbourne Ministry in 1841—an event which terminated the series of administrations directly owing their existence to the Reform Act of 1832. The author resumes his task with the year when the accession to power of the Conservative party under the guidance of Sir Robert Peel opened an entirely new era in political life, infused fresh energy into the government of the empire, and began that great series of social and financial reforms which followed closely upon the political changes of the preceding decade. Sir Robert Peel had succeeded not only in reorganising the party of which he was the head, after a crushing defeat sustained less than ten years before, but he had himself adopted to a large extent the Liberal principles which could

alone find acceptance in a reformed Parliament, even with a Tory majority; and he gradually infused into the legislation of the country as much of the Liberal policy of the future as circumstances would permit; not, it must be said, without some sacrifice of consistency and some breach of old engagements. From that moment the old Tory party was powerless, if not extinct, and it underwent the transformation we have witnessed into the modern Conservative party, whose principles of administration are much more nearly allied to those of their old opponents than to the obsolete creed of Lord Liverpool, Lord Eldon, and Lord Castlereagh.

This it is which gives so keen an interest to the political and parliamentary records of the period embraced in these volumes. They extend, indeed, even now, over no more than half the Queen's reign, and they leave another long and important period of nearly thirty years to be related by some future historian, or, as we hope, by Mr. Walpole himself. The events recorded in these volumes begin with the accession of the Peel Administration in 1841, and end with the Indian Mutiny in 1857.

The difficulties of the writer who seeks to deal with contemporary or recent history arise not from the want of materials, but from the excess of them. Parliamentary papers and blue-books would fill a library, and are multiplied at the rate of about fifty volumes a year. Parliamentary debates have become inordinately prolix, and the numbers of Hansard accumulate with excessive rapidity. Yet it is necessary for the historian to take cognisance of this *indigesta moles*, and to extract from it some quintessence or residuum of fact and reason, worthy to be remembered of men. Mr. Walpole appears to us to have performed his task with extraordinary industry, precision, and success. He has acquired a familiarity with the pages of Hansard which very few men possess, and which must be the result of infinite labour and research; but as the language of parliamentary debate is liable to be one-sided and misleading, he relies still more on the authority of the official papers presented to the House of Commons, from which all that can be known of the statistics of the empire may be extracted. The patience which has carried him through these long and tedious researches displays itself in a taste for figures which is not common, and a belief in their demonstrative accuracy which some of us do not share. It is impossible by any artifices of language to revive an interest in extinct budgets, or in the financial expedients of the last two generations.

But those who desire to understand the financial history of the Queen's reign have the materials condensed with great skill in Mr. Walpole's pages; and the readers who are less easily attracted by these details will find ample subjects of interest in the later chapters of his work. It must never be forgotten that good finance is the first condition of good government; and that the greatest statesmen are never so great as when they contrive that the burdens of the exchequer shall sit easily on the people.

The picture of the state of the country in 1841, with which the fourth volume opens, is a gloomy one, and if our present contemporaries are loud in their complaints of the depression in agriculture and trade from which all classes are suffering, they will do well to reflect on far greater evils borne at an earlier period. The public revenue of the preceding years had failed to equal the expenditure, and the proposals of the minister of finance had not met the deficit. The distress of the people, which had been increasing since 1837, had attained proportions which it is difficult to realise. The trade of the country and the food of the nation were still burdened with heavy duties, and the prices of the most necessary commodities were raised by an artificial system of protection. Even under that system the distress of the agricultural classes continued, and was only exceeded by the wretched condition of the inhabitants of the great towns. It was stated on the authority of the Statistical Society of Manchester that one-tenth of the population of Manchester and one-seventh of the population of Liverpool lived in cellars, or in hideous abodes, without drainage, without the decencies of life.

The pauper roll of England and Wales rose in 1842 to 1,429,000 persons, or, allowing for the increase of population, nearly double what it is at present. Wages were incredibly low. The country was devoured by the canker of pauperism, to which the New Poor Law of 1834 applied a stern but necessary remedy; for the poor laws had demoralised and pauperised the people. We think Mr. Walpole is hardly fair to the authors and administrators of the New Poor Law when he says that 'the stern despots of Somerset House' would not listen to any appeal for mercy in passing from 'one system to another.' It was a gross misrepresentation on the part of the adversaries of the law to impute cruelty, or even harshness, to the Poor Law Commissioners, or to the boards of guardians who carried the law into effect. It is untrue that outdoor relief ceased in England, as is proved

by the fact that the number of paupers relieved reached its maximum in 1842. Moreover, the union-houses in many parts of the country were not then built. The conditions annexed to admission to the union were not cruel, and the condition of the inmates was vastly improved. In short, when the alleged grievances under the new law were carefully investigated by a parliamentary committee which sat for two sessions, instead of denouncing the law the Committee declared that it had improved the condition of the poor, and that the Commissioners had acted with zeal, ability, and discrimination. These facts Mr. Walpole admits and records. We are the less able to understand the severe language in which in some places he speaks of the administration of the law. The experience of fifty years has convinced us, and convinced the country, that of all the reforms carried in that period none was more needed, and none has proved more successful, than the Poor Law of 1834. The passionate opposition to it, which has long since died away, is only another proof of the blindness of popular leaders to the true interests of the people; and meanwhile pauperism has decreased to about half the rate at which it stood in 1842, having regard to the large increase of the population.

Socialism and Chartism flourished in 1840, says Mr. Walpole, side by side. Both were due to the same cause—the misery of the people. Both of them aimed at the same high object—the amelioration of the people's lot. Yet the two associations had widely different objects. The Socialist desired to improve the people's income and material condition; the aim of the Chartists was the political enfranchisement of the working man. It deserves to be remarked that the wild theories of the Socialists, though still in existence, have made no sensible progress, whilst the political claims of the Chartists—a name of terror to a former generation—have been conceded by Parliament and have brought the class of working men and agricultural labourers within the active mechanism of the Constitution; and this has been done with no detriment to the State, and with no fear of those acts of violence which caused the riots at Birmingham and Newport.

Such was the condition of the people when Sir Robert Peel assumed the reins of government in 1841.

“When Toil plays, Wealth ceases,” said Gerard. “When Toil ceases, the People suffer,” replied Sybil. The great strike of 1842 proved the truth of both dicta. The prospects of improvement which

were afforded by the good harvest were destroyed by the disturbances; and the suffering of the spring was exceeded by the deeper misery of the autumn. Almost every class in the kingdom participated in the universal distress. In one town, of which particulars were given, out of eighty shipbuilders thirty-six failed; five ceased working; the wages of the carpenters whom the remainder employed fell from 38s. to 21s. a week; the shopkeepers found it almost impossible to keep their shops open; the butchers sold only one-half the quantity of meat which they had disposed of the year before; the relief of the poor, which had only cost 7,035*l.* in 1837, amounted to 14,232*l.*; and the charitable people of the neighbourhood contributed 2,192*l.* in money and 800 tons of coal to the relief of the distress; the few people who maintained a precarious independence were crushed by the weight of supporting their neighbours; and the rates rose to 18s. in the pound, and were equal to two-thirds of the rack rental of the town. Sunderland, however, was only one of the towns which suffered from the distress. Throughout the length and breadth of the kingdom there was one universal wail of misery. It might have been said of Britain in 1842, as it had been said of Judah more than two thousand years before, "She hath received of the Lord's hand double of all her sins;" and no Isaiah had yet arisen to speak comfortably to the nation, and cry unto her that her appointed time was accomplished, that her iniquity was pardoned.' (Vol. iv. pp. 138, 139.)

The Prime Minister started with the conviction that population was increasing more rapidly than the supply of provisions in this country, and that the first want of the nation was more abundant and cheaper food. That was the simple but essential principle which guided and governed his measures. They began with the memorable budget of 1842 which removed or reduced a multitude of duties, and which rectified the revenue by the bold measure of the income-tax—reforms leading up by logical necessity to the repeal of the duties on foreign corn.

Peel had not the art of educating his party which was practised with success some years later by his antagonist and successor; and even at this early period the faith of his followers was tried and shaken by a policy they could not comprehend. Mr. Walpole is rather too fond of a sarcasm at the 'country gentlemen,' as he terms them, as if that class were actuated by none but selfish motives. But whether they were right or wrong, the country gentlemen represented the great landed interest of the country—the farmer and day labourer as well as themselves—for experience has shown that their interests cannot be separated. Through good and evil report Peel persevered, more jealous of the welfare of the people than of the traditions of his party, which he eventually sacrificed.

'The mighty change in the condition of the people, which commenced in the ministry of Peel, and which has been continued almost uninterruptedly ever since, was not solely due to the fall of one political party and to the rise of another to power. The contests, indeed, which men dignify with the name of History are only little bubbles floating on the surface which enable us to mark the movements of the tide. To ascertain the true causes of the prosperity, the inquirer must go beyond even the great Budget of 1842. What Peel really did in that year was to accelerate and accentuate an impulse which was already prepared. He found a country staggering under burdens which a mistaken policy had imposed, which made everything dear, and which did no good to any human being. He saw the necessity of removing the load, and he removed it. And by making England a cheap country instead of a dear country he gave enterprise an opportunity which it had never known before.' (Vol. iv. p. 177.)

No sooner had he put his hand to the plough and admitted the influence of the principles of free trade than a marvellous rebound took place in the productive industry of the people. From 1842 to 1845 the value of exports rose from forty-seven to sixty millions. The number of hands employed in some Yorkshire factories rose 30 per cent., and the price of the necessities of life diminished. Crime, too, decreased by one-third.

But, as Mr. Walpole points out, it was not solely to political or financial changes that the rapid improvement of the condition of the people was due. These measures coincided in point of time with the introduction of mechanical inventions, which, far more than the arts of government, have altered all the conditions of human life. The application of steam to locomotion by land and sea, and the still greater marvel of the electric telegraph, brought every part of these islands into rapid communication, and ere long extended their all-embracing powers over the whole globe. We endeavoured in the last number of this Journal to explain the mighty revolution effected by these mechanical agencies on the whole system of modern trade, and this is so true that not only the merchant, the pioneers of civilisation, and the State are benefited by them, but their influence extends to the very humblest member of the community. Of all the signs of progress which the reign of Victoria has witnessed these are the most universal, the most novel, and the most important.

These changes had in fact begun in the years preceding the accession of Sir R. Peel—in the years following the Reform Act of 1832; and they were perceptible in a

livelier sense of humanity and the disuse of barbarous and brutal customs and amusements.

‘Such a revolution in manners, if it had stood alone, would not perhaps have justified an extended notice. Its importance arises from the company in which it is found. A decade in which duelling fell into disuse, in which the press-gang was virtually abolished, in which cruel punishments in the army were reduced both in number and severity, in which the worst evils of the transported convict’s lot were alleviated, in which counsel were first allowed to felons, in which imprisonment for debt on meane process was prohibited, in which slavery was abolished, in which the slave trade was attacked, in which the first effective Factory Act was passed, in which little children were released from sweeping chimneys, in which dogs were prohibited from drawing—a decade in which the first grant was made by Parliament for the encouragement of elementary education, in which mechanics’ institutes were promoted, in which public baths and washhouses were first provided, in which singing-classes were formed in London, in which schools of design had their origin, in which free libraries were purchased for soldiers, in which a national gallery was first built, in which Victoria Park was purchased, has higher claims on posterity than are afforded by the Parliamentary contests of Russell and Peel. Those who recollect that pauperism and crime attained their maxima in 1842, and that since 1842 crime has decreased and pauperism diminished, will be tempted to ascribe the happier conditions of modern England to the change of thought which accompanied or succeeded Parliamentary reform.’ (Vol. iv. p. 113.)

We do not propose to follow Mr. Walpole at any length in the discussion of the affairs of Ireland, which forms the principal subject of his nineteenth chapter, but if, as we suppose, that chapter was written before the agitation of Home Rule had reached its recent climax, it is remarkable that in this work the author has anticipated many of the arguments which brought about the conversion of Mr. Gladstone to Irish ideas and the Nationalist cause. We need hardly say that we do not share these opinions, and that we retain the conviction that Home Rule would be even more disastrous to Ireland than injurious to Great Britain. But it is worth while to remark that the Repeal agitation has twice within the last fifty years been keenly debated in Parliament, and that it was brought forward by no less a personage than O’Connell in 1834 and in 1843. Mr. Walpole is of opinion that O’Connell was perhaps the greatest Irishman that Ireland had ever known. Undoubtedly his energetic action in 1829 was the immediate cause of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, but Catholic Emancipation had long been advocated and supported by a great majority of the

most eminent British statesmen, and was not solely an Irish measure: it was a measure of toleration and justice. In spite of the powerful influence of O'Connell, we are not told that he proposed or carried any measures calculated to diminish the social evils of Ireland, and he certainly taught his countrymen the most baneful of all lessons when he bequeathed to them the secret and the trade of political agitation. The Repeal movement originated by O'Connell in 1834 had no success: only forty Irish members supported it, and it was crushed by an enormous majority in the House of Commons. That discussion is chiefly to be remembered for the emphatic declarations of Sir Robert Peel against the separation of the two countries. Mr. Walpole appears to suggest that when Sir Robert Peel vigorously opposed the renewal of the Repeal agitation, after it had assumed more formidable proportions in 1843, he was actuated by motives of expediency rather than of principle. That is, we are convinced, an entire misconception. Nothing would have induced Sir Robert Peel to undo the work of Mr. Pitt, or to weaken the connexion of the two parts of the United Kingdom. He therefore repeated, on behalf of Her Majesty, the emphatic declaration of 1834 of a fixed and unalterable resolution to maintain inviolate the Union of the kingdom. Singularly enough, Mr. Walpole remarks that 'Irishmen ' would scarcely have been human if they had submitted in ' silence to this language.'

Sir Robert Peel not only made the declaration, but he acted upon it, and as the Repeal movement had become formidable and was accompanied by the usual incidents of violence and crime, an Arms Bill was introduced. Why not? If under the existing law 'men were shot, houses ' fired, arms seized, assaults committed, cattle houghed, and ' stacks burned, by bands of men whom it was difficult to ' detect and still more difficult to convict, though it is the ' first function of government to preserve order, and Whigs ' and Tories were agreed in concluding that order was im- ' possible if the use of arms were unrestricted.' Mr. Walpole calls an Arms Bill 'one of the old expedients of tyranny.' But is it an expedient of tyranny to disarm a ruffian who threatens your life? Is it an expedient of tyranny to pass laws, or execute laws, which are necessary to prevent or to punish crime? Such measures are sometimes required in Ireland because such crimes are frequent there, and are encouraged by political agitation; they are not required in England and Scotland because such crimes are unknown

here: if the crimes existed, the means of repression must follow. O'Connell's declaration that the Union is a living lie, because one law was in force in England and another in Ireland, is a monstrous absurdity; the difference consists not in the laws, but in the spirit, the habits, and the morality of the people. When a crime is committed in Great Britain the whole population is eager to bring the offender to justice. In Ireland the majority of the population seek to screen and acquit him.

But Sir Robert Peel went further. The Government took effectual measures to render the great Repeal meeting which was to take place at Clontarf impossible, and prohibited it. O'Connell shrank from the decisive step of rebellion, and gave way. Mr. Walpole thinks that his moderation entitled him to the gratitude of the Government. It was the moderation of a culprit in the grasp of a policeman; and, accordingly, a week after the prohibition of the meeting, O'Connell and his leading colleagues were arrested on a charge of conspiracy and sedition. Ministers were bent on crushing Repeal. Was it not their duty to do so?

Mr. Walpole condemns the prosecution of O'Connell, and accuses the Irish Court of Queen's Bench, which convicted him, of partiality and injustice. But, dismissing all technicalities, it is certain that O'Connell was guilty of the offence with which he was charged—namely, that of bringing his countrymen to the verge of rebellion. The majority of the English judges held that the defects in the panel and indictment did not invalidate the judgement. Nevertheless the House of Peers did, upon the narrowest possible technical points, reverse the sentence and set O'Connell free. There is no reason to regret it. The object of the Government was not to inflict punishment on O'Connell, but to destroy his power and stop the agitation. In these respects the prosecution was entirely successful. The influence of the great Irish demagogue was at an end.

Relieved from this difficulty, Sir R. Peel immediately showed that he could deal in a liberal spirit with Irish grievances: a Charitable Bequests Act was passed, Maynooth was endowed, the Queen's Colleges were established, the Devon Commission was appointed to investigate the system of land tenure—never was there a more enlightened disposition to deal with Irish questions. Unhappily the work of reform and improvement was arrested by natural calamities which no one could foresee or prevent. The failure of the potato crop, on which half the population of Ireland relied

for subsistence, led to a famine of the most distressing character, and to a depopulation of the island. The enormous efforts of the British Government and the British public to provide food for the famished masses were only partially successful; but it may be confidently asserted that if Ireland had not been aided, under the Union, by the British Treasury and by British munificence, the ruin of the country would have been total. The calamity which had fallen with such intensity on Ireland produced effects of the utmost gravity in this country. It led directly to the repeal of the Corn Laws, the complete adoption of the policy of Free Trade, the disruption of the Conservative party, and the fall of Sir Robert Peel's Administration. Mr. Walpole's character of Peel is the most carefully finished portrait of a statesman which he has executed; and, though long, we shall insert it in this place.

'It was the memorable reproach of Goldsmith that Burke to party gave up what was meant for mankind. Nearly the opposite was true of Peel. Instead of sacrificing his policy to his party, he was always ready to sacrifice his party to his policy. Conscious of his own superiority, he did not care about the views of inferior men, and he did not even take the trouble of explaining to them the reasons of his opinions. In office he never forgot that he was Minister of England, but he rarely recollected that he was the leader of the Conservative party. Shy, and even awkward in society, he had not the inclination, and he did not court the opportunity, to conciliate and educate his followers in unofficial hours. Impatient of contradiction and hasty in his temper, he could not win support in public by an encouraging smile or a conciliatory word; and so, though his capacity gained him confidence and his character respect, beyond the narrow circle of his own associates he won no man's affection.

'His failure to attract sympathy was due to the severity of his manners and not to the coldness of his heart. His outward aspect, indeed, belied his inner and better nature: and the man who seemed unsympathetic to his followers was capable of kindlier actions than many of those who condemned his insensibility. In the midst of a storm of unmerited obloquy such as had never fallen on any public man, he found time to befriend, as no one else befriended, the dying Haydon. He was the firm and judicious patron of science, of literature, and of art. With the men who attained distinction in these paths he threw off the reserve which he retained for his followers; with superiority, wherever he met it, he was in fact at home; with inferiority he was shy and cold.

'Great men who wish to become great party leaders must, however, learn to unbend to their followers, and Peel's inability to descend to those beneath him aroused in the first instance suspicion, and ultimately excited mutiny. And the result was more serious in Peel's case because he did not fulfil the conditions which Conservatives usually

demand in a leader. They could have forgiven—nay they afterwards did forgive—haughty manners in a Stanley; they would not tolerate them in a Peel. Though by education and in wealth Peel was superior to most of his followers, he was inferior to many of them in birth. They were identified with the older generation of country gentlemen who had governed England up to 1832; he was the representative of the new ideas, and of the new men, who were destroying the power of the old landlords more effectually than the Reform Bill. And thus it happened that, though Peel was the opponent of that measure, he personally gained more than any other statesman from its passage. For the middle classes, on whom the franchise was conferred, recognised in him both a representative and an example, while he understood their views and their wants much more clearly than any of his contemporaries. Hence he was able, almost alone, to maintain an authority in the Parliament of 1833 such as no other statesman has ever secured without numerical support; and hence, notwithstanding his connexion with an unpopular party, he was regarded thenceforward both by friend and foe as the most capable of living statesmen.

‘But the very reasons which won Peel the confidence of the nation excited the natural distrust of his own supporters. Accident made him the leader of the Conservative party; conviction made him the greatest reformer of the century. On organic questions, indeed, Peel lived and died a Conservative; and as, by a strange limitation of language, the term Reform in political circles is usually confined to organic questions, posterity even now has failed to appreciate the radical nature of the policy which Peel introduced. Yet no statesman, either of this century or of any preceding age, had, up to his time, effected reforms so great and radical as those which were accomplished by Peel. Grey, indeed, closed a long and consistent career by carrying in his old age the great revolutionary measure whose principle he had advocated in his youth. But the one reform which will always be associated with the name of Grey was exceeded in importance by the six great reforms which this country owes to Peel. In 1819 Peel reformed the currency; in 1823 he reformed the Criminal Code; in 1829 he emancipated the Roman Catholics; in 1842 he reformed the Tariff; in 1843 he reformed the Banking System; in 1846 he repealed the Corn Laws. Who is that Minister whose admirers can boast that his name can be associated with six reforms so beneficent and so enduring as these?

‘There is, however, another question raised by his policy which is of more interest. How came it that Peel, in the course of his career, found it necessary to abandon almost every opinion which he had begun life by supporting? Is it not a reflection on his sagacity that none of his earlier views stood the test of later experience, but that one after another of them was flung overboard as useless lumber, for the Inglises, the Bentincks, and the Disraelis to cling to? Ought he not to have foreseen, when he embarked on politics, that the course which the Tories were steering was leading to disaster? and ought he not to have joined another crew, and committed his fortunes to another pilot? The true answer to such a contention is to be found in the

circumstances of Peel's career. He entered Parliament at twenty-one years of age. He had passed his youth amidst Tories at home, at school, and at college; and, immersed in the studies which gained him distinction at the University, he had not had leisure to examine the great political questions which were to exert so vast an influence on him afterwards. He inherited his earlier opinions; he thought out, for himself, his later conclusions. It would thus be as reasonable to blame Luther for commencing his career as a Roman Catholic as to blame Peel for commencing his career as a Tory.

'The six great questions which he was mainly instrumental in settling are divisible into three classes. The reform of the Criminal Code and the emancipation of the Roman Catholics were measures of domestic reform. The resumption of cash payments and the revision of the Bank Charter were measures of financial policy. The reform of the Tariff and the repeal of the Corn Laws were commercial measures. 'But, though these great measures are divisible into different categories, they all partake of the same characteristic which distinguishes the whole of Peel's policy. Slow in approaching any great subject, his treatment of it, when he once decided on dealing with it, was thorough. For the sake of carrying their measures, most ministers resort to compromise. Peel almost alone carried all his projects in the shape in which he introduced them. Other ministers sacrifice details for the sake of carrying their principles. With Peel the details of each scheme formed an indissoluble part of an harmonious whole.

'This circumstance undoubtedly testifies to his capacity as a statesman. He was the greatest statesman of his own age, and he ranks among the foremost statesmen of all ages. Inferior to Walpole in tact, to Chatham in vigour, to Pitt in his ingenuity in devising taxes, to Canning in his eloquence in expounding policy—in knowledge, in judgement, and perspicacity he was superior to all these men. And thus he stands in the front of all his contemporaries, and in the front rank among the other great men to whom the destinies of England have been committed in the past.' (Vol. iv. pp. 376–381.)

Mr. Walpole justly remarks that the history of human thought is the most comprehensive and the most difficult subject which can occupy the attention of the historical student, and no doubt the progress of thought is the key to the progress of society. The thought of the foremost thinkers, who are rarely understood by the mass of their own contemporaries, is gradually assimilated by the next generations, and he who would trace the past or future evolution of events must seek for the motive power in which they took their origin and their direction. We could have wished that Mr. Walpole had followed this path of enquiry further. It would have been of great interest if he had traced the influence on English society in the reign of Victoria of the utilitarian ethics and political economy of Mill, of the scepticism of Mr. Buckle, of the philosophy of Mr. Herbert

Spencer, of the theories of Mr. Darwin, of the historical school of Oxford, and of a class of agnostic writers who deny the existence of a supernatural Power. The progress of scientific discovery would offer a no less instructive field of observation: in astronomy, in chemistry, in electricity, in biology, and in other branches of natural research, it is no exaggeration to say that the studies and investigations of the last half-century have laid open a new heaven and a new earth. But this portion of contemporary history is but slightly noticed in these volumes, probably from want of space to enter on so wide a theme, and indeed it belongs to the later rather than to the earlier years of the reign. Mr. Walpole, whose sympathies are not clerical, has nevertheless devoted the chapter in which he traces the progress of thought to ecclesiastical topics—the condition of the Church of England, the rise of the Tractarian party in the Church, and the disruption of the Church of Scotland. We must confine ourselves to two or three observations on this part of the work.

It is easy to draw a gloomy picture of what Mr. Walpole calls the ‘rotten and corrupt condition of the Church in ‘1835.’ The abuses of pluralism, mal-apportionment of ecclesiastical revenues, torpor, intolerance, and bigotry were flagrant. No one made war on them more constantly than we did ourselves in the pages of this Journal.

‘Thus, at the time at which the first Reform Act was passed, a double attack was being made upon the Church. Rationalism and science were assailing its spiritual position; rival sects were assailing its temporal position; and just as the violence of the assault which reformers had led had driven the friends of order to rally under Peel, so the vigour of the blow dealt at the Church drove the friends of religion to rally in its defence. But as, in politics, some men desired to resist the advance of revolution by conceding necessary reforms, while others imagined that revolution could best be checked by resisting all further change, so, in religion, one party desired to save the Church by admitting all the friends of Christianity into its fold, while another party thought that its defence could not be undertaken at all unless every member of the garrison was content to subordinate reason to faith, and to serve, without questioning, under the standard of authority.’ (Vol. iv. pp. 402, 403.)

These facts cannot be forgotten. But Mr. Walpole has, we think, not done full justice to the powerful movement by which the Legislature and the Church herself shook off these abuses. The first act of Sir Robert Peel in 1835 was the creation of the Ecclesiastical Commission, which has revised and reformed the system of Church property. The Oxford

movement, however little we may agree with its Romanising tendencies and sacerdotal pretensions, had undoubtedly the merit of inspiring the clergy of all opinions with an amount of fervour and emulation in good works which the previous generation had not known. The zeal of the laity was roused, and at no time have greater efforts been made, at the cost of millions raised by voluntary contributions, to provide for the spiritual wants of a growing population. Of the existing schools for the people three-fourths have been founded and supported by Churchmen. The result has been an enormous increase in the power and utility of the Church, which is certainly one of the most striking characteristics of the Queen's reign, and would merit a fuller record.

Mr. Walpole has given us a full account of the rise of the Tractarian party and also of the causes which led to the secession of the Free Church in Scotland; and he draws a curious parallel between these two movements. He remarks that both of them were marked assertions of spiritual authority against the control of civil law, and that if the High Church party in England was feeble in comparison with the Scotch secessionists, it was because the English clergy were aristocratic and unwilling to relinquish their emoluments. But the differences between the two movements are far wider than their analogies. The High Church party in England retains its position and its benefices, because it hopes to strengthen *within* the Church its doctrine and its ritual, and the principles of the Church of England are wide enough to embrace a great breadth of opinion. The secession of the Free Church in Scotland was, on the contrary, a revolution, led by men resolved to break away from the control of the civil power altogether, not as regarded doctrine or discipline, but as regarded patronage and property; and the object of it was to overthrow the Church Establishment of that country. The spirit of the High Church party in England was sacerdotal; that of the Scotch secessionists was radical and democratic; and they retain these distinctive characteristics to this day.

Mr. Walpole is mistaken in supposing that 'the Privy Council officially declared that the right of determining doctrines resided in the State and not in the Church' (p. 437). The Privy Council has in all its ecclesiastical judgements emphatically disclaimed any such right or power. All that it has ever done is to decide whether in each given case the conduct or language of an inculpated clerk did or did not render him obnoxious to ecclesiastical censure, in

obedience to the language of the Common Prayer-Book. No one has ever claimed for the Crown or its lay advisers the right of 'determining doctrines.'

No writer of our time has dealt with the foreign relations of this country and its successive ministers with greater care and a more judicial impartiality than are displayed throughout these volumes. Indeed, if we have any criticisms to make on this part of Mr. Walpole's work, we should say that he sometimes puts too favourable a construction on the policy and the actions of foreign statesmen opposed to British interests. But he is essentially a friend of peace: he disclaims even national successes which are the result of violence; and he abhors the semblance of deceit and intrigue. These are wise and noble maxims, but unhappily violence and intrigue are often used against ourselves and against the rights and liberties of the world. Writing in this spirit, Mr. Walpole is the first historian who has done full justice to the foreign policy of Lord Aberdeen, and to the entire truth and equity which established and maintained for five years the most cordial relations between the Cabinets of France and England, in spite of some incidents which might have troubled them. Nor was Sir Robert Peel's Foreign Secretary less fortunate in settling differences of moment between this country and the United States. One of his first acts was the mission of Lord Ashburton, which terminated the old controversy on the north-eastern boundary; the last event in his administration was the settlement of the Oregon question, the news of which reached London on the very day on which the ministry announced its retirement. Lord Aberdeen's correspondence demonstrates the extreme importance which he attached to this affair, and his resolution to deal with it with equal firmness and moderation.

But the maintenance of peace depended on the relations of France and England. They had been seriously disturbed by the events of 1840 and the intervention of the Four Powers in Syria and Egypt, which had isolated and irritated France. M. Guizot took office whilst the storm was still raging, and fortunately within a few months the British Foreign Office passed under the control of a minister not less desirous to preserve peace and ensue it. The personal relations of M. Guizot and Lord Aberdeen (although they had previously been unacquainted) assumed a character of intimacy which has rarely, if ever, existed between the rulers of two rival nations. They were absolutely resolved to combine for great common objects, and to subdue by entire frankness and mutual con-

sideration those minor differences and difficulties which arose not unfrequently from the rivalry or misconduct of their respective agents in different parts of the globe. In their eyes the maintenance of a pacific and friendly policy between the two great Western States was of immeasurably greater importance than any petty triumph of national ascendancy. Thus it was that, when untoward incidents occurred in Tahiti, in Morocco, in Italy, in Switzerland, in Greece, and in South America, the spirit and power of the alliance sufficed to conquer or to arrest more serious results. The reign of Louis Philippe, and the period of the Restoration which preceded it, have not left any conspicuous marks in history. We are reminded by the interesting reminiscences the late Duc de Broglie has left us of his parliamentary life that the political contests of those days, though animated at the time, touched no vital interests of the nation. But that is precisely the chief merit of these reigns: they were years of parliamentary government under the ægis of constitutional laws, undisturbed by wars or perilous adventures—free alike from military despotism and from democratic persecutions, but remembered now, alas! chiefly by the disastrous revolutions which marked their fall.

In the eyes of a wise English statesman the maintenance of constitutional government in France was a thing not rashly to be imperilled, for it was the basis of the alliance of Western Europe. Unhappily that alliance was sacrificed in great measure by the infatuated determination of King Louis Philippe to control the marriages of two young Spanish princesses by dynastic considerations. The King of the Belgians wrote in a confidential letter now before us:—

‘It is strange, and, in fact, unjustifiable, and I may say unexampled, that a foreign sovereign *not* the father or guardian of another sovereign should very quietly say to that other sovereign of extensive kingdoms, “There are two or three very shabby princes, one of whom you must and shall marry.” Indeed, if the good king would consider the affair quietly, he would be astonished himself at the real *monstrosity de la prétention*.’

Sir Robert Peel wrote in April, 1846, also in a confidential letter:—

‘If the King of the French should meditate a departure from the engagement which is binding on him as a man of honour—and which prevents him from seeking an alliance with the sister of the Queen until after the marriage of the Queen, and until she *has had children*, we are, in my opinion, completely released from any obligations,

express or implicit, patent or secret, about this marriage. If we can with honour, without any breach of good faith towards Louis Philippe, now declare for the independent choice of her own husband by the Queen of Spain, with the consent of the constituted authorities of the Spanish people—irrespective of any Bourbon claims—I believe this would be our best policy.'

Mr. Walpole says that the engagement was that the Montpensier marriage should not take place till Queen Isabella was married and *had issue*. That is not quite correct. All the confidential records of the conversations at Eu say 'children,' *in the plural*; and to take at once the highest authority, the Queen of England herself wrote on March 6, 1846:—

'The King's engagement at the Château d'Eu (which he made quite spontaneously) was that he never would think of it as long as it was a political question, and not only not until the Queen *was married*, but not until *she had children*, which last they now seem to omit.'

The dates of these letters prove that in the spring of 1846, before the fall of Sir R. Peel's Administration, the intentions of the King of the French were regarded with distrust in England. But at the very same time an intrigue of an opposite kind was actively carried on at Madrid, where M. Bresson, the French minister, and Mr. Bulwer, the British minister, were contending with great ardour and acrimony for ascendancy. Mr. Walpole rightly says, 'Bulwer 'thought his employers wrong in assenting to Guizot's 'principle, and with characteristic insubordination set himself to defeat the accomplishment of the Bourbon marriage,' and, he might have added, to bring about the marriage with Prince Leopold of Coburg. On April 24 Bulwer reported to Lord Aberdeen that Rianzares, the husband of Queen Christina, had said to him, 'In the present state of Spain 'there is but one good candidate, Prince Leopold of Saxe 'Coburg. Do you think that possible?' And a day or two afterwards M. Isturiz, then minister, said, with hardly any preface, 'The Queen must be married; and the happiness 'and peace of Spain depend upon her marriage being with 'Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg. The only question is how 'this can be brought about. The Queen herself and the 'Queen mother are both disposed for it.' Bulwer affected neutrality; stated that his instructions were to support a Bourbon prince, but confessed that his own notions on the subject had begun to change. Eventually Bulwer said in reply to Isturiz that there were but two ways of following up this scheme—by negotiations with England and France,

or by a direct proposal to the family of the Prince of Saxe Coburg. The negotiation was obviously impracticable; therefore the latter alternative was adopted, and on May 6 Bulwer reported to Lord Aberdeen that a letter from Queen Christina to the Duke of Saxe Coburg (the father) formally proposing the marriage of the young Queen with his son was written. This letter was communicated to Bulwer, and he consented to forward it by a courier to Lisbon.

This occult transaction was highly disapproved by Lord Aberdeen. His opinion was that even if the Coburg marriage was desirable, the proceeding in question would make it more difficult to accomplish, and that anything like an active clandestine interference in the matter was unworthy of a British minister and inconsistent with fair dealing with France. He therefore took the most effectual steps to repudiate any share whatever in such an intrigue by communicating to M. de Ste. Aulaire, the French ambassador in London, the fact that the Spanish Government entertained serious thoughts of effecting the marriage with Prince Leopold, and that this project had been encouraged by Mr. Bulwer, acting without the instructions and contrary to the intentions of his Government. Lord Aberdeen was of opinion that this step was not only due to his own honour and character, but that it was more likely than anything else to diminish the objections of the French Government to the marriage itself.

We have related these particulars, which were probably not fully known to Mr. Walpole, because they are characteristic of the high honour and wisdom of Lord Aberdeen. But they also point to the obvious reflection that when the conduct of foreign affairs passed, in the month of June, into other and less frank and friendly hands, Mr. Bulwer still remaining at Madrid, the French Government had some solid grounds for the belief that the subsisting arrangement was threatened. Lord Palmerston's private letters to Bulwer, of July 19, 1846, and August 3, which are published in the third volume of Mr. Evelyn Ashley's *Life*, expressly declare his preference for the Coburg marriage, and that the marriage of Montpensier with the Infanta would be 'as bad as if he married the Queen.' He added that 'the marriage of a French prince with either of the daughters of Christina would be a plain and public declaration to Europe that both Spain and France are looking forward to a combined war with England; and we should have to govern our conduct accordingly' (p. 266). These were Lord Palmerston's

deliberate opinions. They were known in Paris, and they certainly did not tend to maintain a cordial alliance between the two countries. But the hostility and the intrigues of others do not justify, though they in some measure explain, the subsequent conduct of the French Government. The breach of faith as to the date of the marriage of the younger Princess with the Duke de Montpensier was not the less flagrant because Lord Palmerston avowedly wished to prevent both the marriages, and by attempting to prevent them brought them about.

In the first chapter of his fifth volume Mr. Walpole comments with severity on the manner in which Lord Palmerston conceived and carried out his policy; and he shows by numerous examples—such as the expulsion of Mr. Bulwer from Spain in 1848, the inglorious attack on Greece in 1850, the bitter hostility to Austria shown by the rejection of mediation and the desire to receive Kossuth, the connivance with the Sicilian insurgents—that most of these passionate adventures ended discreditably, irritated foreign countries, and annoyed Lord Palmerston's colleagues, until the approval he expressed in 1851 of the *coup d'état* of Napoleon led to his temporary expulsion from the service of the Crown. Lord Palmerston subsequently returned to office in another and a higher capacity, in which he rendered great public services; but it deserves to be remembered that after 1851 he did not resume the foreign department of affairs, and does not appear himself to have desired it.

Twice, and twice only, in the course of the Queen's reign has Great Britain been compelled to put forth to their full extent her naval and military resources, and to engage in war with all the strength of the realm. We allude to the war with Russia in 1854–56, and the re-conquest of India after the Sepoy Mutiny in 1857. These were events of conspicuous magnitude, which cost the country great sacrifices; but these sacrifices were not made in vain, and in our belief they were absolutely necessary to the maintenance of the character, dignity, and safety of the empire. We are afraid that Mr. Walpole does not share these sentiments. He is more at his ease in relating the peaceful triumphs of national industry and finance than in following the track of fleets or armies, and he appears to suffer from a melancholy conviction that the measures that drove England to arms were generally wrong. A writer can hardly relate the Crimean war from an English point of view who declares that 'he has studiously refrained from a single word which could

‘give pain to any reasonable Russian, and so increase the ‘unfortunate estrangement between two great nations whom ‘I would fain see allied’ (vol. v. p. 87, note); and he evidently regards the character and the conduct of the Emperor Nicholas with an indulgence, a faith, and an admiration which we cannot share.

Our own opinions and convictions on these subjects have long been before the world, and if any of our readers will do us the honour to revert to the review of the two first volumes of Mr. Kinglake’s ‘*Invasion of the Crimea*,’ which appeared in this Journal * in April, 1863, they will find there a very full and minute account of the causes and circumstances which led to hostilities. To these statements we adhere, and we adhere to them with the more confidence as it may now be stated without impropriety that the article in question was written with the direct authority of Lord Clarendon, and that he himself carefully revised it, and supplied many points of information not otherwise made public at that time. We differed widely from Mr. Kinglake, who attributed an excessive importance to the influence of France; but we differ still more widely from Mr. Walpole, whose account of these transactions is a partial vindication of Russia at the expense of Lord Stratford and the British Government.

To put it shortly, we hold that the sole cause of the war was the ambition, violence, and treachery of the Russian Czar, who thought the moment was come when he could use with effect the enormous accumulation of military and naval stores which he had collected at Sebastopol for the subjugation or dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. On the part of Russia the war was wholly aggressive; on the part of the Western allies wholly defensive; for although, after the Russians had been defeated on the Danube, the invasion of the Crimea was an operation of offensive war, it was clear that so long as Sebastopol and the Black Sea fleet remained what they were, the attack might at any moment be renewed. The language of the British Cabinet was: ‘We have ‘undertaken to defend the territory of the Sultan from ‘aggression, and that engagement must be fulfilled.’

The conquest of Turkey had been the aim of Nicholas through life. Mr. Walpole says that ‘every educated ‘Russian sighs for predominance at the Porte, which is the ‘Gate of the Russian empire.’ Early in his reign the Czar attacked the Turks with indifferent success; later on he

* *Edinburgh Review*, vol. cxvii. p. 307.

extorted from the Sultan the treaty of Unkiar Skelessi; in 1845 the real object of his sudden visit to London was to endeavour to win over the British Government to share in the plot and to divide the spoils, in which he signally failed; and his conversations with Sir Hamilton Seymour in 1853 renewed the attempt to bribe this country with Egypt and Candia at the very moment when he was about to make a direct attack on the Porte. The pacific character of Lord Aberdeen, the language of Mr. Cobden, and the *res nova* of the French Imperial power, led him to suppose that the favourable opportunity had arrived.

The primary ground of British resistance to the occupation of Constantinople by Russia is that it would establish in the Levant a first-class Mediterranean naval Power, backed by enormous military strength, and governed by the policy of the most arbitrary, exclusive, and despotic State in Europe. It is sometimes said that we went to war in the Crimea for the sake of India. Nothing can be more untrue. If Great Britain chose to assent to the Russian occupation of Constantinople and its immediate consequences, she could instantly obtain that alliance which Mr. Walpole desires, and we should hear no more of aggression in Central Asia. Security could easily be purchased on the north-west frontier by the surrender of Turkey, but it would be purchased at the cost of the liberties of Europe, and a Power as barbarous and as formidable as that of Solymán the Great in the sixteenth century would be established on the Bosphorus. These considerations are of even more importance to the States whose territories are watered by the Mediterranean Sea than they are to Great Britain, and it will ever redound to the honour of the British and French governments of that day that they engaged in hostilities, renouncing all intentions of territorial aggrandisement, but resolved for political reasons to avert a great danger from the commonwealth of European States.

British ministers were no doubt deceived by the assurances and declarations of Nicholas, who laid an especial claim to the character of a gentleman and man of honour. Lord Aberdeen and Lord Clarendon had some difficulty in thinking so much duplicity and treachery to be possible on the part of the Czar. It could only have been practised upon natures nobler than his own. But before the game was played out the whole plot was revealed, and the sting of detection and defeat cost the Czar his life. Nicholas died unregretted by his own people, for whom he had done nothing, and his

downfall was the liberation of Europe from a widespread policy of despotism and reaction, which it was his object to perpetuate.

So far was Great Britain from assuming a hostile attitude towards Russia that the puerile contest between France and Russia about the Holy Places was adjusted by Lord Stratford in favour of Russia, although, as the Grand Vizier declared, by the strict letter of existing treaties France had the better claim. But that was not the object of Menschikoff's mission, which was to insult the Porte, to leave an ultimatum, and to provoke a war. Every one of the subsequent measures taken by the British Government was the result of the increasing insolence, menace, and aggression of Russia; at each stage the British Government hung back, until Russia advanced. The policy of England was not 'practically moulded by Stratford at the Porte.' It was forced upon us by the march of Russian armies across the Pruth, and the attack on the Turkish fleet at Sinope.

Mr. Walpole appears to doubt whether the order for the allied fleets to enter the Bosphorus was consistent with the Treaty of 1841, which closed the Dardanelles in time of peace; and he adopts the Russian argument that the occupation of the principalities did not involve an act of war. But Lord Clarendon had already declared to Baron Brunnow, on October 1, that 'the Porte had ceased to be at peace when 'the first Russian soldiers entered the Danubian principalities, and that from that moment the Sultan had a right to 'invite the British squadron into the Straits, and Her 'Majesty's Government had a right to send the British 'squadron into and, if necessary, through the straits.' In point of fact, the Porte declared war against Russia on October 4, and the presence of the fleets was necessary to prevent a direct attack on Constantinople by the Russian naval power—an attack which fell with dire effect on Sinope, in spite of the Czar's positive declarations that he should not assume the offensive. Mr. Walpole complains of the imprudent haste with which war was declared, and the eagerness of the British nation to send the fleet into the Baltic, 'for the ice in the Baltic was beginning to break up.' But, in fact, the fleet sailed from Spithead on March 11, though it was not possible for the ships to approach the Russian coasts till the end of May or beginning of June.

It is a peculiar circumstance of this contest that negotiations for peace were carried on with more or less activity during the whole of it. But these negotiations were decep-

tive and insincere. Russia had no intention of abandoning her demands or relinquishing her prey as long as Nicholas lived. Sebastopol was not taken. These futile attempts at an arrangement arose from the hesitating and ambiguous conduct of the German Powers. If they had adhered to their declarations and agreements and co-operated with the Western allies, war would have been impossible, and peace might have been imposed both on Russia and on Turkey. We shall not be tempted, however, to go back on these transactions. They were chiefly useful because they demonstrated that Great Britain and France had left no means untried to avoid the extremity of war. If any one desired war it was the Emperor Nicholas, who believed himself to be invincible.

It is a mistake to suppose that any hostility exists between the people of England and the Russian nation. On the contrary, we wish the Russian nation to have a better government than it possesses at present. We rejoice in any sign of the internal progress of the country; we hailed with enthusiasm the great and noble measure of the emancipation of the serfs by the late Emperor. But a government which directs all its skill and energy to encroach on the territories of its neighbours; which seeks rather to extend its influence and territorial dominion abroad than to improve the condition of its subjects at home; which does not scruple to break through express treaty engagements, and to defy the public law of Europe, is a source of danger to the world. The Treaty of 1856, which terminated the war, caused Russia to relinquish her aggressive policy for twenty-three years. That was a considerable advantage, and we do not regret what it cost us. In this century few public engagements have lasted untouched for more than the life of a generation. But as time rolls on Russia has shown a disposition to take every opportunity of resuming that policy; and in more recent years the repudiation of the neutrality of the Black Sea, the renewal of the Black Sea fleet, the attack on Turkey in 1878, the fortification of Batoum, and the scandalous conspiracy to which the Prince of Bulgaria has fallen a victim, prove that the spirit which led to the war of 1854 is not inactive. Germany, meanwhile, has become the leading Power of continental Europe, and it rests with her statesmen to avert the danger which threatens German and Austrian interests far more than those of England. It is an untoward circumstance that the policy of Germany is paralysed by the fact that the Germans are

the largest foreign creditors of Russia, and that a Russian war or financial crisis would re-act with terrible effect on Berlin.

The present moment is not a propitious one for an English writer to advocate a Russian alliance. We cannot forget that the three most important wars which have occurred during the Queen's reign, that of 1854 and the two expeditions into Afghanistan, have been the direct result of Russian aggression, and that the tone of public opinion in Russia, as well as the restless policy of the court of St. Petersburg, are singularly hostile to this country, because, apparently, they think that Great Britain is the Power most likely to oppose with effect a system of conquest. No other European State has this aggressive character; least of all is this the policy of England. Even Mr. Arnold Forster, who adopts what we may term the fatalist view of Russian aggrandisement, confesses that 'the extension of Russian authority over any portion of the earth's surface seems to be an unmitigated curse and calamity to the spot so afflicted.' The process is now going on in Bulgaria, where the experiment of a free and autonomous government has been tried for seven years, with more success than we had anticipated from the character of the people. That success is the very reason that Russia interposes to blast it. The Emperor Nicholas declared to Sir Hamilton Seymour that there were two things he would never submit to: the one, that Constantinople should fall into the hands of any other European Power; the other, that the Turkish territories in Europe should be divided into a number of small free States. The Treaty of Berlin sanctioned the latter experiment; but it was obvious that the petty kingdoms of Servia, Roumania, and Bulgaria are only morsels reserved for a future invasion, which the extinction of the Ottoman power will render easy, if Germany and Austria do not resist it. Our own interests in this territorial question are extremely slight, and we have no inducement to interfere in the matter beyond the expression of our good-will to the Bulgarian people. But the maintenance of the faith of treaties, as the basis of peace, can never be indifferent to England, and we view with distrust any infraction of it.

Mr. Walpole says that 'centuries hence some philosophic historian, generalising on the rise and possibly the decay of England, will probably dwell with different emphasis on two circumstances. He will relate the history of the British in India as a romantic episode which has had no appreciable effect on the progress of the human family. He will describe

‘the growth of England’s colonial empire as the true monument of British greatness.’ He has not, however, acted upon this presentiment, for he has devoted three of the most interesting chapters in his book to the ‘romantic episode,’ and he relates the history of the Indian Empire from the later years of the last century down to the Sepoy War of 1857. It would be difficult to point out anywhere a more succinct and complete account of the administrations of Lord Wellesley, Lord Cornwallis, Lord Moira, Lord Minto, and Lord William Bentinck; and the sketch concludes with an animated account of the fierce struggle which restored India to the arms of Great Britain after the great Mutiny. But we look upon the exertion and defence of British authority in India with a deeper interest and admiration than Mr. Walpole expresses. So far from being merely a ‘romantic episode,’ we regard it as the greatest achievement of British policy and valour beyond the shores of this island, and we hold that to have established peace, law, good government, and civilisation amongst the countless millions of Southern Asia has had an immense effect on the progress of the human family, and has contributed as much to the wealth and power of this country as to the welfare of India itself. This imperial work has been accomplished entirely by British statesmanship, exercising absolute authority with a small amount of military power, upon principles of justice, and a progressive policy hitherto undisturbed by party contests. On the other hand, the colonial empire of Great Britain has made itself. Over the colonies the authority of the mother country has not always or often been wisely or beneficially exerted. The best policy for England to pursue in regard to them is to leave them alone—to leave them with the utmost freedom to work out their own destinies. Their success is due to the energy of the settlers of British race, who took with them to foreign lands the principles of law, freedom, and enterprise. They are the creation of the people of these islands, detached from their old homes, but not of the Government; and although we view with the deepest interest every sign of the attachment of the colonies to the empire of which they form so important a part, we are sensible that it is to the independence of their local governments and legislatures that they owe their strong allegiance to the Crown. Centuries hence the larger colonies will probably have become great States, proud of their own nationality, as the Americans now are. But under whatever form of government, we trust that ‘Greater

'Britain' will ever include in bonds of cordial amity the people of the English-speaking races.

In India the task was altogether different, and in proportion difficult. There England governs a far more numerous population, divided by caste, by religion, by race, and by independent sovereignties, all alien to herself. Those who are averse to wars and annexations of territory, as things evil in themselves, have some difficulty in estimating at its true value the great imperial result. Mr. Walpole judges with some severity the lofty designs of Lord Wellesley, and the measures taken by men as pure of all guile as Mountstuart Elphinstone. But step by step the great fabric has been raised, and even the great princes of India have been converted into loyal feudatories of the British Crown. This much is certain, that the independence and self-government of the Indian peninsula are impossible, and if ever the British rule in India were relaxed or overthrown the country would relapse into anarchy, war, and barbarism, with a conflict of races and religions from which British authority has rescued the population. Mr. Walpole comments with severity on the Afghan War, the conquest of Scinde, and the annexation of Oude, and no English or foreign writer has drawn a darker picture of those transactions. It would carry us too far to attempt to discuss these large and complicated questions, though we cannot accept the terms in which he occasionally describes them. Not even the greatest and most successful of Indian Viceroys can escape his censure, though he admits that 'events had made the British the paramount Indian power, and that millions of the human race had no remedy against their oppressors except through British interference.' The true defence of British policy is that it has given to the nations of India an infinitely better government than they could have framed for themselves, and has founded an empire which occupies a leading place in the world. We prefer to turn from these debateable points to the generous language in which Mr. Walpole winds up his remarks on Lord Dalhousie's administration.

'It would be both an injustice to Dalhousie himself and to the great Company he represented if the student of Indian history concentrated all his attention on the salient features of his policy, and omitted to notice other and more beneficial consequences associated with his administration. No previous Governor-General had ever conferred such material and varied benefits on the country which he was called on to rule. It was under Dalhousie that railways in India were first

projected, first sanctioned, and first constructed; it was under Dalhousie that uniform postal rates both throughout India and between India and England were first adopted; it was under Dalhousie that the first telegraph lines were laid, and the first telegraphic communication instituted; it was under Dalhousie that canals for the double purpose of navigation and irrigation were pushed forward with an energy which the world had never previously seen. Nor was it in work of this character alone that Dalhousie's administration stands pre-eminent. It was under his rule that vernacular schools were first instituted in India, and it was under his rule, though not by his action, that the civil service of India was first thrown open to public competition. Such achievements as these are the true monuments of British rule in India, and ought to be set against the many actions of British Governors which it is neither possible nor desirable to defend. If England has frequently waged war without cause and annexed provinces without justification, she has at least been the instrument of accomplishing material and moral progress; and the Englishman who relates these things, and who scruples not to condemn what he cannot excuse, may point to the material blessings which England has given to her great dependency, and say of them and of his country—

“These are imperial works, and worthy thee.”

(Vol. v. pp. 363–364).

And we must add the not undeserved tribute he pays to the great servants of the East India Company, by whom these works were prepared and accomplished.

‘The old Company, whose rule was abruptly ended, had undoubtedly played a great part in the world's history. In a single century it had amassed an empire, and had brought one person in every six in the world into subjection. Its servants had been guilty of some crimes and some blunders, yet they had shown a capacity for rule directly attributable to the circumstances in which they had been placed. Where else in the world's history can be found a dependency which, in the course of one short century, has had its fortunes entrusted to three men of the capacity of Warren Hastings, of Wellesley, and of Dalhousie? and which has produced in the same period among its subordinate officials such men as the two Lawrences, as Havelock and Outram, as Mountstuart Elphinstone and Malcolm, as Metcalfe and Munro? “Great countries,” said Disraeli long ago, “are those which produce great men.” The old East India Company may at least boast that it produced great administrators.

‘It is no doubt true that the servants of the Company did not all possess the capacity of Munro, the culture of Elphinstone, the energy of John Lawrence, or the kindly nature of his brother Henry. They were, of course, men with the faults and passions of men. Many of them, placed in situations of great power and great independence, did and said many brutal and corrupt things. It would have been strange if it had been otherwise. But it is none the less true that the best and wisest of the Company's servants, the men who have at once been the

guides and the examples of their fellows, have displayed a pure and unselfish desire to promote the moral and material prosperity of the vast population amidst which their life has been spent; and that the world has seen few instances of purer and holier work than that which such men as Outram, as Sleeman, as the Lawrences, and a score of others have done in India in the present century.

'The rule of the Company, as a whole, was both great and good; and, with all its shortcomings and all its faults, it deserved the commendation bestowed on the faithful steward in the parable. This result has been quite as much due to the capacity and conduct of the officers trained in the Company's service as to the men who have presided as Governors-General over the empire. With the exception, indeed, of Wellesley and Dalhousie, no Governor-General during the present century has impressed his personality on the history of India; and Dalhousie is not merely the last of the great Governors, he has probably made it impossible for the future to produce a greater Governor-General.

'If, however, India is not, consequently, likely to produce in the future either a Wellesley or a Dalhousie, its future rulers may display qualities less brilliant and less dangerous, but at least as beneficial to the mighty province over which they are called on to preside. The men whom England has lately sent to govern India have, with few exceptions, displayed a deep and religious sense of the vast trust committed to them. They have laboured to promote the moral and material progress of the country; to elevate the masses; to fit them, in a constantly increasing extent, to discharge the higher duties of citizenship; and to entrust the best of the Indians with a larger share in the administrative and judicial duties of their country. To preserve peace, to maintain order, to promote justice—these are the arts of modern government, and by these arts, and not by conquests and wars, is the empire which the Company won to be preserved.

'If Dalhousie was the last, and in some respects the greatest of the old type of Governors, Canning was one of the first and one of the greatest of the new class of rulers. That he had defects in his character, and that his defects were attended with serious consequences, it would be absurd to deny. A Clive or a Wellesley, or even a Hastings or a Hardinge, would possibly have stamped out rebellion more rapidly, or confined a revolt within narrower limits. But neither Clive nor Wellesley, neither Hastings nor Hardinge, would have furnished subject India with so grand an example of the nobler features of the British character. The man who maintained his equanimity amidst panic, whose courage never quailed amidst disaster; who, conscious of his own virtue, moved calm amidst obloquy; who, amidst rage and tumult, in the hour of severity never forgot to be just, was a ruler worthy of the great country whose honour, in the hour of her supreme peril, was entrusted to his keeping.' (Vol. v. pp. 429-432.)

As the work proceeds we are more and more struck by the immense range of subjects which fall within it, for a history of England in the nineteenth century becomes of necessity a

history of the British Empire and of a great part of the world. It is at once a narrative of the past and a prospective survey of the future. Colonial history alone, and indeed the history of each British colonial establishment in various parts of the globe, would require volumes to do justice to the record. Mr. Walpole is compelled to confine to one of his concluding chapters a rapid survey of this prodigious theme; but he has pointed out in general terms the causes which led to the great outpouring of the British race to the continents of America, South Africa, and Australia, in the present age, beginning with a scanty emigration of some 5,000 labourers to the Cape in 1819, and rising to millions before the present time. At the beginning of this century the United States contained about 5,300,000, and Canada less than 500,000 inhabitants. In 1880 the United States contained more than 50,000,000, and British North America 4,500,000 people; and the vast region of Australia looms like the planet Jupiter in the imperial system, awaiting in the fulness of time the growth of future generations. The abolition of the close mercantile system, which treated the colonies as the satellites of the mother country, the establishment of free local institutions, and, above all, the facilities of cheap and rapid intercourse, have all conduced to these astonishing results, which will have a permanent effect, not only on the welfare of England but on the condition of the world, since at their present rate of progress the English-speaking race will soon far outnumber all the other civilised people of the globe. One cannot without anxiety take this glance into the future; for if British institutions and British enterprise have led to this result, it imposes on those who have any influence on the policy and manners of this country an incalculable responsibility. The metropolis will continue to be the centre of social life and culture, even to independent States and nations; and the true part and duty of England is to retain and uphold the high standard of religious faith, of moral integrity, of intellectual activity, of truth and legality, which alone entitle her to serve as a beacon and a guide to the offspring of these islands.

We cordially concur in the concluding words of Mr. Walpole's preface, where he says:—

'When England is preparing to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of her Sovereign's accession to the throne, it may serve some useful purpose to dwell on the social condition of her people at the commencement of the present reign. Those who will contrast the account which the author has endeavoured to give of the England of that time with

their knowledge of the England of to-day, will perhaps share the author's conclusion that the true monument of the present reign is not to be found in its military successes, its colonial developement, or even in its industrial achievements, but in the moral and material progress which the people have almost constantly made.'

And we are persuaded that the cordial efforts of all classes and the tendency of all our institutions to promote the welfare of the people is the cause of the exemption which this country has enjoyed from the political convulsions, contests, and changes which have affected some of the other nations of the world.

ART. VIII.—*Letters and Despatches of Horatio Viscount Nelson, K.B. Selected and arranged by JOHN KNOX LAUGHTON, M.A.* London: 1886.

IF Southey's *Life of Nelson* were as satisfactory as it is popular, there would be less room for a book such as Mr. Laughton's. But Southey fails in many respects to give us the full picture of Lord Nelson's acts and character which he is commonly supposed to have done. His materials—chiefly the *Lives of Charnock, Harrison, T. O. Churchill, and Clarke and McArthur*—in no way approach the completeness of those now at our disposal. But the contempt and disparagement which he pours upon all these writers would alone suffice to shake our faith in any structure built upon them. Southey had difficulties of his own to contend with. The narrator of a sea story who 'walked among sea terms 'as carefully as a cat does among crockery' was at a terrible disadvantage. His undoubted genius could not supply the place of knowledge, which was not great enough or close enough to enable him to discriminate in the choice of his materials. Nor could he, for the same reasons, give proportionate weight to the sentiments of the man, and the admiral; nor to the circumstances which dominated Nelson's thoughts, or which his thoughts modified. He was entirely unable, from his position and antecedents, to separate that which was naval and general from that which was Nelsonian and particular. In more than one instance he has given us traits as peculiar to Lord Nelson which were simply part of his naval training, and were to be found not only in most naval men of his day, but still exist as part of the naval character. Thus his picture could not fail to be somewhat incomplete and possibly sometimes misleading.

Southey never seemed to grasp the main points of Nelson's tactical aims, but he is not to be so much found fault with on this account, as men at the admiral's elbow did the same; and others with full information have followed suit. Yet, as we shall see, these main points were always alike, and always so direct and simple that it is perversion of thought to surround them with a halo as though they were the outcome of profound intellectual effort. Southey has made little attempt—perhaps it was beyond him—to analyse the character of the great admiral in such a way as to show where the chief elements of his power lay. In his view there was such solidity, profundity, and rigidity about the character of Nelson that a lapse—or what Southey chose to think a lapse—was a complete break in the continuity. It was like a fault in geological stratification. The natural character was left where the fault showed itself, and it was taken up again, perhaps at a much lower level, after the unaccounted for depression. The freak of nature which broke the continuity had done its work, and nothing could ever bring those harmonious laminæ into connexion again. In a word, our impression is that Southey was not in sympathy with the subject of his biography. He wrote in formal sentences, cold and precise in structure, when had he been in any way stirred there would have been less formality and more warmth. No doubt he tells the story of a great sea officer, but hardly the story of the ‘affectionate, fascinating little fellow,* with a shock head, and ‘the same honest, simple manners’† in the days of his greatness as before its dawn. Yet this was the light in which some of those who were most intimate with him held him in their regard.

In illustration of what has been said as to the lack of sympathy, we need only refer to the time-worn story of Caracciolo. It would, we think, have been impossible for a man in real sympathy with Nelson to have written as Southey did, impugning his motives on this occasion. ‘Doubtless,’ writes Southey, ‘the British admiral seemed to himself to be acting under a rigid sense of justice; but to all other persons it was obvious that he was influenced by an infatuated attachment—a baneful passion which destroyed his domestic happiness, and now, in a second instance, stained ineffaceably his public character.’ There is no reason to believe that such an idea as this would ever

* Rev. A. J. Scott.

† Lady Minto.

have gained a place in the public mind had Southey not put it there. Even Miss Williams does not go so far, and only finds fault with Lady Hamilton on the question of good taste. The treatment that Caracciolo met with at the hands of Nelson was entirely to be calculated on. A writer in the 'Westminster Review,' in the course of a notice of the 'Letters and Despatches,' struck the key-note of the whole matter, and rendered further discussion redundant when he pointed to Nelson's letter to Sir John Jervis, of July 9, 1797, which will be found at page 125 of Mr. Laughton's book. Sir John Jervis, in the face of strong remonstrance from his second in command, Vice-Admiral Thompson, ordered the execution *on Sunday morning* of certain mutineers sentenced to death the night before. Nelson thereupon wrote that he 'very much approved of' the action of his chief. And to Sir R. Calder he said, 'I am sorry that you should have to differ with Vice-Admiral Thompson, *but had it been Christmas Day* instead of Sunday 'I would have executed them.' Caracciolo was, in Nelson's eyes, a mutineer and a rebel taken red-handed. What had the English admiral ever said or done to lead to the belief that he would soften towards such a criminal? Rebellion and mutiny were to Nelson as the deadly sin. He who had committed it could only expect to be swept off the face of the earth in an instant when he came before the admiral's judgement seat. Later writers—and notably the author of 'Paradoxes and Puzzles'—have shown that there could not be a more mistaken idea than to make Lady Hamilton the relentless virago, and Lord Nelson the easily moved and softhearted judge. Lady Hamilton would have been on the merciful side had she been consulted; and Southey admits as much when he accepts Clarke and M'Arthur's statement that Caracciolo himself suggested the probability. But Southey insinuates the contrary view when, following his authority, he allows that no personal appeal was made to her. 'She was not to be seen,' he says, 'on this occasion.' Of course she was not to be seen. Southey had himself given the reason, and a full answer to all his charges a few sentences back. 'Sir William and Lady Hamilton were in the ship; but Nelson, it is affirmed, *saw no one except his own officers* during the tragedy which ensued.' Lady Hamilton was not to be seen because these were public and official transactions with which she could not, by the customs of his Majesty's fleet, be in any way mixed up. In the whole of this narrative, Southey, in his want of

sympathy with Nelson's character, had suffered himself to fall into the hands of Miss Helen Williams. She, admitting fully that her authority came from a tainted source, was so careless a writer as to put Caracciolo amongst the prisoners captured in the castles, and a few pages further on to show that he was not amongst those prisoners. And Southey is so eager to follow her transports of indignation, that he makes the ridiculous mistake himself of stating—in extension of Foote's assertion—that Nelson first publicly annulled the capitulation of the castles and then induced the garri-sons to come out 'under pretence of carrying the treaty 'into effect!' An unreflecting naval writer, such as Captain Brenton was, might possibly accept, and even exaggerate and add to, the palpable embroidery of the pen which has spread over these transactions. But he who has noted on the one hand the remarkable inflexibility and tenacity of Nelson's character, which was one of the elements of his greatness, and on the other hand the way in which civil writers have failed to grasp the effect of his position on board his flagship, will be fully satisfied that no extraneous influence, baneful or other, is required to account for the transactions in Naples Bay in 1799.

Mr. Laughton, as a lecturer on naval history to naval officers, must have been brought face to face with the deficiencies of Southey; and it would seem from his preface that this stimulated him to produce his book. It must be remembered, however, that Mr. Laughton makes no attempt to draw any of those inferences as to springs of thought, instinctive impulses, and methods of reasoning, which are proper to the work of the biographer. He has entirely limited himself to the definite object described in the first three lines of his preface. He has made the selection 'with the view of bringing within a moderate 'compass, Nelson's own exposition of his professional life,' and therefore the reader who would endeavour to place himself in full sympathy with the autobiographer, must read much between the lines. But, on the other hand, those who are content to stop short at the knowledge of what Nelson did, why he acted in particular ways, and generally of his particular methods of action, will find sure and most interesting guidance in Mr. Laughton's selection. It was, in fact, time that a single volume of this sort should appear. It has been objected that the earnest student ought to go to the complete collection of Lord Nelson's letters, furnished by Sir Harris Nicolas, and that the student who is

not earnest will not trouble himself to peruse the condensed edition now presented to him. We do not share in these views, but are, on the contrary, satisfied that the book has supplied a real want. No doubt Mr. Laughton has been specially anxious to provide for the needs of junior naval officers, and was aware that mere questions of space had something to say to these officers' unfamiliarity with the seven volumes of Nicolas. The earnest student who cannot carry to sea with him the whole of Nelson's words will not be averse to take a selection of the most important of them as an instalment; and he can but have his appetite whetted as he makes himself more and more familiar with the character here partially revealed.

There is an obvious advantage in the method adopted by Mr. Laughton, inasmuch as if he has fairly employed it he avoids any possible mistakes which might be made by a mere biographical decorator. We may not see the whole of the building in its due proportions, but we may fairly expect to see the bare stone, and therefore to avoid being misled by draperies, or even by paint and whitewash. Yet, though this method may secure us against direct glosses which are misleading, indirect glosses, perhaps more insidiously powerful, may remain by the omission of matter which may seem out of harmony with the compiler's view of the character.

A life so dramatic, and a character so various as Lord Nelson's will never cease, until some life more dramatic, and some character more various, arises, to inspire efforts to display his characteristics in broader masses, and to analyse his acts with a closer minuteness. We shall ever be striving after a greater intimacy with the workings of his mind, chiefly because of their obvious and remarkable contrasts. But it is inevitable that we should take a side from the moment we begin to form an acquaintance with the great sea officer's extraordinary personality. Where that which appears—using ordinary language—weak, was as active and self-asserting as that which was strong, how can men agree in their estimates? How arrive at a just balance? So does Mr. Laughton object to the estimates of Southey, and equally condemn the fuller judgements of Pettigrew. It shocks him to think that the great Admiral should have been—as it would be commonly put—small enough to write some not very good verses a few hours after the desperate fight of Copenhagen. He brushes the idea aside as unworthy of a moment's thought. To suppose such a thing 'is to suppose 'that Nelson could write grammatical twaddle in verse,

‘ though in prose, grammar and twaddle were equally foreign
‘ to his style; and is further to suppose that the evening of
‘ a hard-fought day, April 2, 1801, after a sleepless night,
‘ was the particular time that Nelson spent in writing this
‘ trash. I do not believe,’ he says, ‘ that he ever in his whole
‘ life, wrote a line of verse, or could have written one even
‘ had he wished.’ It may be fully granted that the idea of
Nelson writing indifferent verses at any time is repugnant
to our sense of the fitness of things. Our first attitude
must be one of blunt denial when we are told that not only
did Nelson write indifferent verses, but that he wrote some
such at the time stated. But we strongly suspect that
our feelings have been excited in opposition, simply because
our intimacy with Nelson has not been close enough. Mr.
Laughton supports his disbelief by finding ‘ grammar and
‘ twaddle’ in the verses which are not to be found in the
prose. The first lines of the verses stand as follows in
Pettigrew’s transcript:—

‘ From my best cable tho’ I’m forced to part,
I leave my anchor in my angel’s heart;
Love, like a pilot, shall the pledge defend,
And for a prong his happiest quiver lend.’

We shall presently show that the verses are not quite so
bad as they seem; but, admitting the twaddle, we shall be
compelled to deny the grammar. To ‘part’ a cable is to
break it, to snap it; and if the technical meaning of the
word be here given to it—which is almost necessary to com-
plete the simile—we should have the writer speaking of
‘snapping *from* a cable.’ If the technical meaning is not
admitted, the line still remains in a grammatically weak
state. But this is a trifle, introduced but to meet a trifling
objection. The real difficulty we have to contend with, if
we deny that Nelson wrote the verses, is that Pettigrew
gives them in fac-simile of Nelson’s handwriting, vouched
for by Mr. T. Crofton Croker, who was one of the senior
clerks of the Admiralty when Pettigrew published his
‘Memoirs of Lord Nelson.’ The emendations in the fac-
simile are such as to preclude the idea that it was a copy,
and the note, still in Nelson’s handwriting, at the bottom
runs:— ‘St. George, April 2, 1801, at nine o’clock at night,
‘very tired after a hard-fought battle.’ Curiously enough,
there is a simile, not at first apparent, in the last two lines
which almost stamps them as a sailor’s work, and which
Pettigrew, by a wrong transcription, has missed. The word

printed by Pettigrew as 'prong' is certainly 'buoy,' and completes a simile such as Lord William Gordon, the reputed author of Nelson's verses, would hardly have knowledge enough to employ. If a ship leaves the anchor by which she has been riding, behind her, either from accident or necessity, she leaves a buoy attached to it or moored near it, in order that, by marking the spot, she may be able to recover the anchor on her return. Love lending one of his quivers as a 'buoy' to mark the spot where the anchor had been left, has a practical seamanlike ring about it which cannot escape the literary sailor, however much he might deprecate the assignment of different degrees of happiness to the rest of them. If we remember that these verses are entitled 'Lord Nelson to his Guardian Angel,' and that he was in the habit of speaking of the picture of Lady Hamilton which hung in the cabin of his flagship as his 'guardian angel;' and if we further bear in mind that he and the picture were parted during the battle, there is a dim and vague, but yet striking connexion between the circumstances and the allusions, that give corroboration, if any were wanted, to the inference that the lines are really Nelson's, and were really written on the night of Copenhagen.

No doubt there are many who could not fall into this belief without a consciousness of doing injury to a great memory. But to others, Nelson's memory is less great and more dear. Some faint echoes of the passionate devotion which held his followers during his life reach them after all these years, and keep his minor individualities in a tender remembrance not to be lightly abandoned. For our own part, we are not prepared to say that any mere apparent incongruity will lead us to deny what may be alleged on otherwise good grounds to have been done by Lord Nelson, unless such acts should savour of cunning, meanness, or treachery. None of these failings are compatible with what we know of his character, and it is safe to deny that in act or thought he ever approached them.

But Mr. Laughton has set the evidence of style against the more direct testimony in this case, and we think he has been mistaken. In another case this kind of evidence has not misled him. He has excluded the celebrated Syracuse letter with the allusion to the 'fountains of the "Arethusa,"' from his selection 'as being a palpable forgery,' and the chief evidence in favour of this view is the style. Through the kindness of Mr. A. Morrison we are able to quote entire the genuine letter, of a very different character, which is now

in his possession. It is to Lady Hamilton, and runs as follows :—

“Vanguard,” Syracuse: July 22, 1798.

‘My dear Madam,—I am so much distressed at not having had any account of the French fleet, and so much hurt at the treatment we received from the Power we came to assist and fight for, that I am hardly in a situation to write a letter to an elegant lady. Therefore you must on this occasion forgive my want of those attentions which I am ever ambitious to show you. I wish to know your and Sir W^ms plans for going down the Medⁿ; for if we are to be kicked in every port of the Sicilian dominions, the sooner we are gone the better. Good God, how sensibly I feel our treatment, I have only to pray I may find the French and throw all my vengeance on them. With my affectionate regards to Sir William, believe me, with the greatest respect, your ladyship’s most faithful servant,

‘HORATIO NELSON.’

Though this is conclusive of the forgery, and sets in a remarkable light the exceeding clumsiness of the forgers, it does not wholly clear up certain obvious difficulties noticed by Mr. Laughton. The substance of the letter to Lady Hamilton is in entire agreement with that of the same date to Sir William Hamilton. But it is in direct opposition to the substance of the letter to Sir William Hamilton written next day, which is printed by Nicolas from a copy, of which the original is in Mr. Morrison’s collection; and also to Lord Nelson’s last testimony to Lady Hamilton’s services. Mr. Laughton’s surmise that Lady Hamilton had persuaded Nelson of that which was not the fact, might account for the last discrepancy, but not for the first. Could it be that between the 22nd and 23rd of July the tone of the authorities at Syracuse changed in consequence of some communication from Naples? Or was the letter of the 23rd a diplomatic document to be shown to the King?

Mr. Laughton takes exception to some writers—possibly Sir John Barrow and Colonel Stewart—who have said that Nelson was ‘no seaman.’ Sir John Barrow said he was not a ‘thorough seaman,’ and Colonel Stewart tells a story which might perhaps be held to confirm him. Was Barrow wrong, and did Colonel Stewart state as an eye-witness that which did not really occur? We shall do well to remember that there is a general, and a particular, meaning attached to the words ‘seaman’ and ‘seamanship.’ Many inferior sea-officers have been able to say, using the particular sense and believing that there was no other, that some really great officers were ‘no seamen.’ ‘Seamanship’ to this day, in its narrow and particular sense, denotes a knowledge of small

details of very little use or importance, and a 'thorough seaman' is often, in the estimation of such men, one who is entirely without resource the moment he finds himself in circumstances for which no authority has prescribed a treatment. In this narrow sense, and in detailed knowledge of what authority—very often wrongly—dictated, it is more than probable that Nelson was not a 'thorough seaman.' Let Colonel Stewart's relation speak for itself. The scene is laid off Dungeness, on board Nelson's flag-ship the 'St. George,' then on her way to the Baltic, in the month of February, 1801. The colonel says:—

'His lordship was rather too apt to interfere in the working of the ship, and not always with the best success or judgement. The wind, when off Dungeness was scanty' (the gallant colonel should have written 'scant'—approaching the reverse of 'fair'), 'and the ship was to be put about. Lord Nelson would give the orders and caused her to miss stays. Upon this he said rather peevishly to the master, or officer of the watch (I forget which), "Well, sir, what do you mean to do now?" The officer, saying with hesitation, "I don't exactly know, my lord; I fear she won't do," Lord Nelson turned sharply towards the cabin and replied, "Well, I am sure if you do not know what to do with her, no more do I either." He went in, leaving the officer to work the ship as he liked.'

It is true that this story is told by a military officer, and it might be said that as such he could be no judge of nautical skill. Yet it is easy to see that such a point of criticism is not available here, and that Colonel Stewart is detailing exactly and truthfully what passed under his own eyes and within his own hearing. It is worthy of remembrance also that there were few men who held Nelson in higher admiration and regard, or who would have obeyed his orders, or shared his fortunes with more confidence than he who tells this story. He could have had no conception that the little characteristic he thus recorded could ever have been regarded as other than a pleasant foil to its magnificent accompaniments. But here again we have the uneasy consciousness that to admit the legitimate inference is to injure the memory of the Admiral. Against the admission, Mr. Laughton brings the conviction that the man who had been first lieutenant of a smart frigate in the West Indies, even though he were not a Nelson, could never be deficient in the details of seamanship. Passing by the conclusion, what are the premises? He had served some six months as acting lieutenant of the 'Worcester,' and twenty-one months as lieutenant in the 'Lowestoft' and 'Bristol,' and he had

been promoted from the last ship about twenty-two years before the date of Colonel Stewart's acquaintance with him. It was only as lieutenant or in junior ranks that an intimate personal acquaintance could be made with the details of seamanship, and it is almost impossible that with so brief an experience, so remote from the era of his greatness, Nelson could have been in the strictly technical sense 'a thorough seaman.' In the wider and higher sense, in the sense in which we have heard a distinguished Russian admiral express it, that 'he is the best seaman who best 'uses the tools put into his hands,' Nelson was undoubtedly 'a seaman.' He showed it equally as a captain 'yawing' the 'Agamemnon,' and firing broadside after broadside into the stern and quarter of the 'Ça Ira,' or as an admiral, in the simple but complete signal, to 'prepare to anchor by the 'stern,' when advancing to consummate the victory of the Nile.

Few, probably, would be rash enough to suppose they took new views of the character of Lord Nelson, and yet all must confess that their intimacy with it is incomplete. He wore his heart on his sleeve for daws to peck at, and if there is anywhere a mystery or a puzzle, it is not to be traced in the secret windings of a tortuous policy, but in the surprising plainness of the motive, and the almost unparalleled directness of its action. Few men act except under the influence of mixed motives, or on what appears to them the resultant of several considerations. A second motive, or a second consideration, seems practically undiscoverable in any of Nelson's acts. And some of the surprise, and much of the lurking distrust with which more than one of his contemporaries regarded him, arose from the difficulty of comprehending—much more governing—a mind so actuated. Such absolute and unswerving directness gave him enormous power, but it was certain to mislead him, and to it must be ascribed the real unhappiness of his life. While, therefore, it would be useless to present Nelson under any other aspects than such as are patent to the ordinary student of his life and writings, it will always be possible to gain a closer intimacy with his character, and to show the continuous action of simple ideas and instinctive germs of thought. This may be done by placing words and acts in fresh groupings, and so attaining, by precise and orderly methods, that which we do spontaneously and without method when we are in close relations with a friend. There is perhaps a deeper interest attaching to this

method. The naval commander, to be a leader of men, must have personal characteristics which are born in him and cannot perhaps be made. A general may become a great one, gain victories, and astonish the world, and yet be a stranger to the colonels of the regiments he commands—intimate only with the members of his staff. But an admiral must be on intimate terms with every captain in his fleet. They are indeed the members of his staff, and his personal ascendancy over them has everything to say to his success as an admiral. Should he misunderstand them, or should they misunderstand him, an ill result will certainly show itself in the presence of the enemy. Too many of our admirals, from Benbow onwards, have felt the difficulty of gaining this ascendancy, and the execution of Captains Kirby and Wade was only an extreme illustration of the want of it. Lord Howe evidently thought that the most marvellous part of the battle of the Nile was that no captain failed; and he believed there was something special in the admiral to produce such a result. But the admiral not only must be personally well known to his captains, it is in the nature of things from which he cannot escape, that he should be very well known by report to every man and boy in his fleet. In his own flagship, his personal ways, his habits, gestures, walk, voice, temper, and methods, are familiar to everybody. He lives in public, and impresses it in one way or in another, according to his conduct before it. Not a boat's crew comes alongside from some other ship that does not hear all the latest stories of 'our old man' from eyewitnesses. Hence the personal character of the admiral in a fleet may almost have a greater influence than what is generally called the public character, and what the man is may be as important a national consideration as what the admiral is.

At the bottom of his great success under all circumstances as a commander, we must place Nelson's power of pleasing, which was inherent in his nature and arose in great measure from that sort of 'enthusiasm of humanity' with which he was filled towards those immediately associated with him. His innate feelings towards his naval companions of all ranks enabled him to establish and uphold what was almost a new school of naval discipline. That school has had vicissitudes since Nelson's day. It was for years wholly thrust out of the naval service, but it is one of the very best signs of the times that it still survives, and that at the present moment all our leading sea officers thoroughly believe in and trust it. Military discipline can be maintained

on either of two bases. Subordinates may be looked upon as passive instruments, always in unstable equilibrium, requiring the constant guard and attention of the commander. In the extreme form of this school of thought, subordinates are regarded as active instruments, but active as veiled rebels or at least as unjust stewards of the trust reposed in them. For a long course of later years the navy suffered, and suffered heavily, from the predominance of this view. A distinguished and very powerful name was at the head of this school of discipline. And followers of the chief, who owed everything to him, spread through the whole navy, and carried with them, after the manner of disciples, views more advanced than had ever been held by the chief himself. Suspicion and distrust formed the groundwork of the systems upheld by these officers, and results full of reproach to the naval name became from time to time the property of that part of the public which rejoices over a scandal. But gradually there was an uprising against a system which was positively without facts to support it, and which lived on tradition. Subordinates protested by their acts against a general charge of disloyalty to their great service. Leaders slowly discarded the artificial systems in which they had been brought up, and began to regard those placed under their command as equally interested with themselves in the success of their joint efforts. The different ranks were drawn more closely together; the respect which was given by the subordinate to the superior was no longer only outward show, but even when it was not instinctively yielded, it was recognised as an important part of the machinery by which success was to be obtained. The superior thus learned that the majority were always with him, and in placing initial confidence in every untried inferior, felt the great truth that the enormous majority of mankind will rise to a display of trust, and become deserving of it when they know what is expected of them.

That which our navy has slowly and painfully learned was instinctive in Nelson. No new officer, no new man, ever fell under his command but the superior instantly sprang into the belief that the subordinate was one of the finest fellows that ever lived. The subordinate as immediately became aware of the chief's conviction, and felt that it would be impossible to belie it. We cannot believe that group after group of officers and men who successively came under Nelson's command were originally the exceptional people he described them to be. It is equally impossible to

doubt that the enthusiastic view of the commander became subsequently a true one.

When he commissioned the 'Albemarle' in 1781 he found his 'quarterdeck filled . . . with very gentlemanly young 'men and seamen . . . an exceeding good master, and good 'warrant officers.' A little later, speaking of them, he says: 'I have an exceeding good ship's company. Not a man or 'officer in her I would wish to change!' Presently the ship's company were 'as good a set of men as ever he saw.' Mitchell, a mate, was 'an exceeding good petty officer.' Bromwich, a lieutenant, was a 'very good officer.' The master was 'the best master he ever saw since he went to 'sea.' 'It was needless to say he was happy in his ship's 'company,' and 'no one could be happier in their officers 'than he was.'

Then when he passes to the 'Boreas' in 1784 we find him 'in fine condition for the beginning of a war; well officered 'and manned.' A young officer under his command was 'amiable in the truest sense of the word. . . . In his professional line he was inferior to none; his virtues were 'superior to most.' 'Jemmy Jamieson,' the master, 'was 'well, as were they all on board.'

Then comes the 'Agamemnon.' Here the officers were 'all good in their respective stations, and known to him, 'except the surgeon.' Presently he is 'very much disposed 'to like Mr. Fellowes (the purser) and *he has told him so.*' In a few days 'he could say with truth' his ship 'was getting into high order. . . . The surgeon seemed to be a very 'good sort of man; and indeed he had every reason to be satisfied at present with every officer in the ship.' In a week he 'not only liked the ship, but thought he was well 'appointed in officers, and was manned exceedingly well.' In another week 'they were all well,' for 'nobody could be 'ill with his ship's company, they were so fine a set.' In a year his 'seamen were then what British seamen ought to 'be . . . almost invincible; they really minded shot no 'more than peas.'

This innate and instinctive feeling showed itself outwardly in a long series of such kindnesses, such tender exhibitions of regard to the wishes, the wants, and the feelings of all with whom he was connected as their superior, as could not fail to establish a devotion akin to worship in the recipients. Singularly sensitive himself to the lightest touch of kindness from others, he habitually projected his own nature into the persons of his officers and men, and drew from the imagina-

tive transfer the inspiration for his acts. Instances abound throughout the letters of the expression of this kind of feeling, both in word and act, but we have now only space for two examples. In May 1804 Rear-Admiral Campbell, at the head of two line-of-battle ships and a frigate, had made so close an inspection of Toulon that he had drawn out in chase of him a superior French force. Campbell retired before it, and an ordinary commander-in-chief would have contented himself with expressing, at the most, a cold and formal approval on receiving Campbell's report. But Nelson felt that retirement before a French force of any kind was a serious thing; and that Campbell's judgement must have been at war with his inclination and that of every man under his command. He would have liked something more than a cold and formal approval himself under similar circumstances, and he followed the bent of his thought in these words:—'I am more obliged to you than I can express for your not allowing the very superior force of the enemy to bring you to action. Whatever credit would have accrued to your own and your gallant companions' exertions, no sound advantages could have arisen to our country. . . . I again, my dear Admiral, thank you for your conduct.'

Nelson's grief at Troubridge's mishap before the battle of the Nile, and the balm which he poured into that wounded spirit is well known and will be easily recalled. But we are about to advert to a little incident which might easily escape notice, and yet is an illustration, possibly without a parallel, of what we have advanced. In May, 1804, several of the ships of his fleet were becoming entirely inefficient from wear and tear. Amongst these was the 'Superb,' of which he wrote that she must be sent to England before the winter 'as her stern and the knees of her head, are loose and broke; nothing but the great exertions of Captain Keats had kept her at sea this last season.' Time went on, and did not naturally improve the 'Superb'; so that, in the same month next year, when Nelson, in Lagos Bay, on the coast of Portugal, made up his mind to give chase to Villeneuve, who had a three weeks' start of him, it was a grave question whether the 'Superb' should not be sent home. If she were even capable of the voyage, it was certain that she would be a terrible drag on a fleet to which speed was all in all. Poor Keats begged so hard that the sentence of exclusion from the glories to come should not be pronounced, that Nelson, still actuated by the fine sensibilities we have described, yielded, and the 'Superb' put to sea with the rest. But

there was no doubt at all about her failings. Every captain saw, day by day, the disabled line-of-battle ship staggering along far in the rear with every sail that would stand set, while his own ship, and the rest, had more sails ready to spread, but could not use them lest the laggard might be dropped altogether. 'That fellow Keats' must have sustained a good many unheard anathemas at the hands of his brother captains; but from him whom the delay was 'killing' there was nothing but the tenderest sympathy. On the 19th May, he prepared a note for Keats, which, however, the chances of weather did not permit him to send till the 27th. 'I am fearful,' he said, 'that you may think the "Superb" does not go as fast as I could wish. However that may be, (for if we all went ten knots, I should not think it fast enough,) yet I would have you be assured that I know and feel that the "Superb" does all which is possible for a ship to accomplish; and *I desire you will not fret upon the occasion.*' Keats must have had a full heart on the 27th of May, and we may be sure that there was not an officer in the 'Superb' who was not touched then, nor a single captain to whom the note was not shown with affectionate comment, even during the few hours of hurried preparation which engaged the fleet in Carlisle Bay.

But it is not so much in the Letters that we are to look for the evidence of the thought passing into action. When we find men longing to come under his command, contrasting the coldness, and the dulness of life in the fleet where he was not, and calculating on the warmth, brightness, and good-will which were sure to follow his arrival, we get some stronger proofs of this power of pleasing and its source in that 'enthusiasm of humanity' of which we have spoken. We find a charming and vivid picture of what was looked for and found in Nelson as the Admiral, from the pen of Sir E. Codrington in familiar letters to his wife. Codrington commanded the 'Orion' under Collingwood, in the preliminary watching of Villeneuve at Cadiz, which occupied the months before the battle of Trafalgar. The life was excessively monotonous and weary. The fleet had fallen 'into the clutches of another "stay-on-board" admiral.' Collingwood, not naturally congenial, was husbanding his daily accessions of pay and prize money, in view of the great object of recovering the family estates. He 'communicated with no one except on service;' he made no attempt to lighten the monotony of standing in to the shore on one tack, and off it on the other. No friends in different

ships could meet or converse, for, even when the weather permitted it, boats must not be lowered. Only when an unfortunate culprit was to be tried by court-martial, and there was a necessary gathering of the captains on board one ship for the purpose, could an interchange of views on any subject be had between those officers. There were not then, as now, abundant and various means of speaking from ship to ship by signal. Even the means which Nelson used later to make his celebrated signal were only a few months old, and were chiefly experimental. There were constant arrivals of vessels with fruit, stock, and necessaries, which were longed for by the crews of the blockading ships, but even the monotony of the daily ration was not to be broken through; and the variation from the pork and pease of one day to the beef and flour of another was to be a sufficing delight to the omnivorous. The time was as weary, as dull, and as dispiriting as it could possibly be. 'Is Lord Nelson coming to us?' wrote Captain Codrington. 'I anxiously hope he may be, that I may once in my life see a commander-in-chief endeavouring to make a hard and disagreeable service as palatable to those serving under him as circumstances will admit of, and keeping up by his example that animation so necessary for such an occasion. For Charity's sake, send us Lord Nelson, oh ye men of power!' But presently, the whole scene changes. 'Lord Nelson is arrived,' exclaims Codrington; 'a sort of general joy has been the consequence, and many good effects will arise from our change of system. He joined us too late yesterday for communication. I had not got any of your letters before I waited on Lord Nelson this morning. He received me in an easy, polite manner, and on giving me your letter said that, being entrusted with it by a lady, he made a point of delivering it himself.' This last is a peculiar little touch. It is impossible to doubt that Nelson had fully calculated, by a reference to his own sympathies, the effect of such a little attention on the mind of a captain newly joining his flag, and yet was so delicately careful as to attribute the act entirely to a sentiment of gallantry. We have thus been told by the best possible witness, of what would be expected by those passing under his command, from Nelson's known antecedents. Let us now see how these expectations were realised. Captain Codrington writes, two days later:—'The signal has been made this morning for all of us who did not dine on board the "Victory" yesterday to go there to-day. What our late chief will think of this, I don't know; but I well know what

‘the fleet will think of the difference; and even you, our good wives, who have some causes of disapprobation, will allow the superiority of Nelson in all those social arrangements which bind his captains to their admiral. The signal is made that boats may be hoisted out to buy fruit, stock, or anything from vessels coming into the fleet. This, I trust, will be a common signal hereafter, but it is the first day I have seen it made.’ No wonder that a ‘general joy’ should overspread the fleet! the monotony of a blockade unrelieved by a single measure to disturb it was at once converted into a pleasureable task in which all were interested, and which was to be carried out with every adjunct of intercourse, good fellowship, and comfort which was possible under the conditions.

The instinctive state of mind on which Nelson thus built a system of discipline that carried every one away with it must, we think, be separated from mere amiability or kindness of heart. Perhaps these latter qualities were most prominently exhibited after the failure of the attack on Boulogne. The unchecked flow of tears at the graves of two midshipmen who were amongst the killed; the mournful references to the dead, the dying, and the wounded; the anxious hopes and fears expressed as the state of ‘dear little Parker,’ dying of his injuries, revealed itself; and the piteous lamentations when the end had come; these are all simple exhibitions of feeling only, which, however, we cannot forbear to recall. ‘Dear Parker,’ the admiral writes, ‘left this world for a better at 9 o’clock. I believe we ought to thank God. He suffered much, and can suffer no more. I have no one to comfort me. . . . My heart is almost broke, and I see I have wrote nonsense; I know not what I am doing. . . . I cannot bring myself to say I am glad he is gone. It would be a lie, for I am grieved almost to death. . . . I fear his loss has made a wound in my heart which time will hardly heal.’ Poor Parker had written from his death-bed that ‘to call him a *Nelsonite* was more to him than making him a duke! O God! how is it possible for me ever to be sufficiently thankful for all his attentions! He is now attending me with the most parental kindness, comes to me at six in the morning and ten at night; both late and early his kindness is alike. God bless him and preserve him. I would lose a dozen limbs to serve him.’

Just as Nelson’s instinctive and initial feeling towards a new subordinate was to love him and to trust him, so it was

with regard to his superiors. And while no more touching side of his character is revealed in his letters than that which shows him glowing with the pride of realised anticipation, there is no sadder employment than to follow his real or fancied disappointments. In his earlier days we can note the birth of these checks to his enthusiasm, and we can follow them up until a bitter growth has established itself and a rank vegetation has spread everywhere. The pleasant side of these characteristics has been exhibited in the earliest of his letters but one which have been preserved. Nelson had joined the 'Lowestoft' in April 1777, and four months only as shipmates had been sufficient to form and rivet the chains of a lifelong friendship between the senior captain and the boy lieutenant. In August the future hero is found addressing Captain Locker in a very remarkable letter, the form of address of which is unique; but the somewhat precise phraseology, due in part to the style of the day, and in part to the youth of the writer, tends to disguise the warmth of feeling under which it was written. The junior lieutenant had evidently been astonished and gratified at the receipt from his absent captain of a communication making him his executor, and thus reposing in him the highest possible personal trust. The letter formally promises to carry out the trust, and ends with a postscript not very grammatical, but only apparently expressing a courtier-like disposition to place himself at his friend's service. 'Though this letter,' he writes, 'is not couched in the best manner, be assured it comes from one entirely devoted to your service.' The words would hardly lead one to think that Nelson wrote them with a beating heart, glowing and thrilling with exultation, affection, and gratitude. What shows that he did so is not the style of the letter, but the very remarkable form of address—'My most worthy friend.' He was surprised, thrilled, gladdened beyond measure, at the trust and confidence suddenly and unexpectedly blazing out upon him from an officer, his own captain, so senior to him in rank and experience. To his astonishment he finds he has gained a lifelong supporter. His self-esteem is profoundly touched by the proof offered of what so competent a judge thought of him, and he responded instantly, in a burst, to his 'most worthy friend!'

It is both interesting and instructive to trace the growth of a feeling which, in another case, passing through stages of stagnation and reflux, culminated in the same hearty and unbounded devotion to its object. Lord Hood's patronage

had been first extended to Nelson as early as 1782, when the latter was captain of the 'Albemarle' on the North American and West Indian station. Nelson was not, however, more than six months under the Admiral's command at this time, and the official connexion terminated by Lord Hood's presentation of the young captain at Court. Communications more or less friendly were kept up between the admiral and the captain, until the former became one of the Lords of the Admiralty, and the latter had been for several years a captain with a grievance—the grievance of half-pay. In 1792 the 'familiar correspondence' had 'ceased on a difference of opinion'—very probably the opinion whether the captain was entitled to a ship or not—and the poor suppliant for employment could 'no longer look upon Lord Hood as 'his friend.' But 'after clouds came sunshine.' The Admiralty so smiled upon the captain who had been five years worrying them, 'that he was almost as much surprised as 'when they frowned.' 'Lord Chatham,' Nelson writes, 'yesterday (January 6, 1793) made many apologies for not 'having given me a ship before this time, and said that if I 'chose a sixty-four to begin with, I should be appointed to 'one as soon as she was ready.' Even Lord Hood was in course of forgiveness. He was 'very civil indeed,' and Nelson cautiously thought they 'might be good friends 'again.' If, reading between the lines, we remember that Lord Hood was sixty-eight years of age at this time, and Nelson but thirty-four, we may easily conclude that, on Lord Hood's part, they had never been anything else, and the characteristic of Nelson which we are endeavouring to illustrate becomes thereby all the more interesting. It is soon made known to the captain of the 'Agamemnon' that he will be attached to Lord Hood's fleet. With that somewhat shy, sensitive feeling that he now experiences towards him, Nelson has never any remarks to make beyond the record of the fact. But at last, the fleet being hove to off Cape St. Vincent in June, Nelson pays the Admiral a visit, and writes on his return to his ship in an unconverted way, but still with some hopes, 'I found him very civil: I dare say we 'shall be good friends again.' At Gibraltar Nelson's hopes are rising: 'The Lord is in a hurry to get from here; we 'think he is to hoist the Union.' At sea again, Nelson is happy to observe that 'the Lord does not spare signals.' Next day he says, as if scarcely inclined to admit the fact, 'Lord Hood is tolerably good friends with me.' In a few weeks the strings are being drawn closer. 'Lord Hood has

‘sent to offer me a seventy-four, but I have declined it. . . .
 ‘Lord Hood has approved of my reasons; *so far well.*’ In another fortnight: ‘Lord Hood is very kind.’ Two months later: ‘The Lord is very much pleased with my conduct about the troops at Naples.’ Next day: ‘Lord Hood is now quite as he used to be: he is so good an officer that everybody must respect him.’ Six weeks later: ‘The Lord is very good friends with me; he is certainly the best officer I ever saw.’ Then, after the horrors of Toulon, and the anxious sieges of Bastia and Calvi, the man who was to be greater than the object of his praise and affection writes: ‘When Lord Hood quits this station, I should be truly sorry to remain. *He is the greatest sea officer I ever knew.*’

The feeling thus expressed towards Lord Hood was a veritable passion towards Lord St. Vincent, on which neither supposed coldness and neglect, nor the unpleasantness of a lawsuit, could make much impression.

‘I wish not,’ he writes to him in June, 1799, ‘to detract from the merit of whoever may be your successor; but it must take a length of time . . . to be in any manner a St. Vincent. We look up to you as we always have found you, as to our father, under whose fostering care we have been led to fame. If, my dear lord, I have any weight in your friendship, let me entreat you to rouse the sleeping lion. Give not up a particle of your authority to any one; be again our St. Vincent, and we shall be happy.’

Two days later, having apparently received confirmatory intelligence of the chief’s illness, Nelson, at nine o’clock at night, makes the following almost filial appeal:—

‘My dear lord, our St. Vincent!—What have we suffered in hearing of your illness, and of your return to Malvern! Let me entreat you to come to us with a force fit to fight. We will search the French out, and if either in Leghorn, Espezia, or Naples, we will have at them! We shall have so much pleasure in fighting under the eye of our ever great and good earl. If you are sick, I will pray for you; and our dear Lady Hamilton will nurse you with the most affectionate attention. Good Sir William will make you laugh with his wit and inexhaustible pleasantry. We all love you. Come, then, to your sincere friends. Let us get you well; it will be such a happiness to us all, amongst the foremost to your attached, faithful, and affectionate
 ‘NELSON.’

The disappointment was bitter and bitterly expressed, when the response to his trust and confidence was not, in his opinion, sufficiently warm. It is sad to note that as time went on the disappointments grew and the enthusiasms

faded. Sir Harris Nicolas sees the beginning of this, near about the date of the above-quoted letter, in a sharp complaint that St. Vincent 'was in no hurry to oblige him, *now*.' Nicolas speaks of it as a 'morbid irritability of temper,' and speculated as to a possible cause in the bad wound in the head which he received at the Battle of the Nile. But we can see, all through the earlier letters, hints of what was to come. Lord Hood had the opportunity of re-conquering Nelson's lost regard, but others had not. Lieut. Duncan, of the Royal Artillery, was in the full sunshine of Nelson's enthusiasm at Bastia. But at Calvi, '*Captain Duncan was an aide-de-camp*, and therefore says nothing. . . . Duncan 'was a little altered; there was nothing like kicking down 'the ladder a man rises by.' What were these thoughts with regard to Hood and Duncan but the embryo forms of those which turned so bitterly against Troubridge at a still later date? From the time when 'dear Troubridge,' 'the 'honoured acquaintance of twenty-five years' standing,' brought him the ships with which he was to win the Battle of the Nile, all through the operations in the Mediterranean, and on till he joined the Board of Admiralty in 1801, Nelson suffered no disappointments in him. But then there was an outburst. Troubridge—'great Troubridge,' in ironical bitterness—was the cause of all his griefs. 'To-morrow week,' he writes from the 'Amazon' in the Downs, and in view of his approaching return to the shore,

'all is over! No thanks to Sir Thomas. I believe the fault is all his, and he ought to have recollected that I got him the medal of the Nile. Who upheld him when he would have sunk under grief and mortification? Who placed him in such a situation in the kingdom of Naples, that he got by my public letters, titles, the colonelcy of marines, diamond boxes, 1,000 ounces in money, for no expenses that I know of? Who got him 500*l.* a year from the king of Naples? and however much he may abuse him, his pension will be regularly paid. Who brought his character into notice? Look at my public letters? Nelson! that Nelson that he now lords it over. So much for gratitude. I forgive him, but by — I shall not forget it. He enjoys showing his power over me. Never mind. Altogether it will shorten my days.'

The conscious naval officer will not fail to note that the enemies in Nelson's, as in our own day, were always in the Board of Admiralty, and that there was, and is, a something in the atmosphere surrounding a Lord Commissioner which renders him always oblivious of past favours, and keen only to inflict rebuffs.

From these sides of Nelson's character we must pass over to another, sufficiently recognised on all hands as a source of his power, and yet we think not wholly understood, namely, his daring. Southey, to our mind, raises an entirely false conception by repeating the story of his childhood. 'I wonder,' says grandmamma to the boy when he had strayed away alone, 'that hunger and fear did not drive you home.' 'Fear, grandmamma!' says the child; 'I never saw fear. What is it?' If such a story is told with any object at all, it can only be to represent to the reader a temperament impervious to fear, stolid and unimaginative. But Nelson's daring was full of consciousness of the danger. He could not but 'see fear' very closely indeed, and the absolute charm that he experienced in going into the hottest fire was due to the mastery of mere physical shrinking, and the delight of subordinating it to his will. Language would probably fail to express the feelings of such a nature in the moment of extreme peril, but if we could fully recall the appearance of the trembling, excited little figure, beside Colonel Stewart on the deck of the 'Elephant' at Copenhagen, the words uttered may have some of the force of the passion which prompted them. 'It is hot work,' cried the Admiral; 'but mark you, I would not be elsewhere for thousands!'

Mr. Laughton has done good service in drawing attention to the popular errors in regard to Nelson's position as a naval tactician.

'It has,' he justly observes, 'been too much the custom to attribute his remarkable achievements to dash, to the magic of his name, to the eager and loving co-operation of all his officers; and to quote expressions—said to be his—to the effect that the whole secret of naval war is contained in three words: "Go at 'em."'

Nothing unhappily is now more common in naval circles, even where it should be least expected, than to hear Nelson's celebrated words before Trafalgar quoted as though they were complete in themselves, and required no context for their elucidation. We are told to remember that Nelson said: 'No captain can do very wrong if he places his ship 'alongside that of an enemy;' and that all study of tactics is, and always has been, useless in view of so grand an aphorism. A half truth is so much more misleading than a downright falsehood, that our generation has fallen under the influence of it. Undoubtedly Nelson said that 'If two fleets are both willing to fight, but little manœuvring 'is necessary; the less the better—a day is soon lost in that 'business,' but we can safely deny that simple dash, without

pre-arranged study and plan, ever had a place in his thoughts. At the same time those who, adopting the ridiculous language of Sir Edward Berry, have gone to the other extreme, and credited Nelson with giving 'minute and precise' instructions to every captain for the attack on the enemy, have been, in our opinion, the more mischievous of the two parties. Nelson's tactics were but the issue of the plainest common sense. He utterly despised the finesse which his early studies taught him that the French had used so constantly and with such good effect from their point of view. But he was full of the belief that in a ship to ship close action, the English line-of-battle ship would win. The primary object was therefore to prevent the enemy from finessing to the extent of preventing the ship to ship encounter. The secondary design was to bring the whole of his force to bear upon a part of the enemy, and to crush that part before it could receive material succour. If, from circumstances, this secondary but very important part of his design could not be carried out, it was the business of every captain to strike when he could, and how he could.

These broad and simple principles were, strange as it may be to say it, new to the navy. The traditional commander in chief had been accustomed to consider it 'presumption' in his vice-admiral to attack the enemy's commander in chief. And well-known rulings by remarkable courts martial had, down to the days of Sir John Jervis, impressed the naval mind with the necessity of abiding by the 'Fighting Instructions,' and carrying out a naval battle with all the formality and precision of a minuet. Jervis was by no means prepared to give up the old formal system when he came in sight of the Spaniards off Cape St. Vincent. Nelson had made acquaintance with Spanish ships, officers, and men, at Cadiz four years before, and had come to the conclusion that if 'six of our barge's crew, who were 'picked men, had got on board one of their first rates, they 'would have taken her.' Here, then, was a case where no apologies, such as Jervis felt himself called on to make in his despatch, were necessary to excuse a departure from the formal system, and where it was really only necessary to strike where and how it became possible.

If the reader will imagine Sir John Jervis's fleet in a line, standing down from the right hand upper corner of this page towards the left hand lower corner, with Nelson in the 'Captain,' near the rear of the line and the upper corner of the page; if he will suppose the Spanish fleet, in

some confusion, passing to the right of the English towards the upper corner of the page which the English fleet are leaving behind them; he will be fully able to realise the whole of the tactical question involved. The fleets are passing one another, and only a scattered and ineffectual fire can be maintained in consequence. If the motion is continued the ships will pass one another altogether, and there will be no real battle. Troubridge, near the bottom of the page, in the leading ship—the ‘Culloden’—is so well aware of the situation, and so confident that a certain signal from Jervis, who is in the middle of the page, ought not to be delayed a moment, that he has it prepared and ready for instant display. The delay—minutes really, but seeming hours—continues. Nelson sees that the opportunity is rapidly vanishing. Presently Jervis makes the signal, ‘Tack in ‘succession,’ which Troubridge, fully prepared, instantly repeats. But however it might have been earlier, this is the wrong signal now, and Nelson is keenly sensible of the fact. The method of obeying it would be this. Troubridge in the leading ship, not now very far from the rear ships of the Spaniards, should turn round to the right, and with the Spanish rear ships on his left should steer with them towards the top of the page. The next English ship behind the ‘Culloden’ should not turn round at the same time as she did, but should stand on and turn only when she reached the spot near the bottom of the page, where Troubridge had turned. Every following ship was to do likewise, and none should turn till she reached near the bottom of the page. The result obviously would have been that only a very few of the English headmost ships could have got into action with a very few of the rear ships of the Spaniards. Nelson, it was quite clear, could not possibly join in the fight at all, but, worse than that, the Spaniards would certainly escape. His resolution was instantly taken, and he threw himself, in entire disobedience to the signal, into the heart of the enemy, *where he was*. The tactical error of Sir John Jervis, which Nelson—terribly to his chief’s humiliation—thus boldly corrected, had been the display of the wrong signal at a vital moment. Had Jervis made, ‘tack *‘together,’* or ‘wear *together,’* instead of those which he did make, the Spanish fleet would have been annihilated, for every English ship would then have turned round where she was, and would have brought her opponent to close action. Unquestionably Nelson would have used either of these signals; it did not require high intellectual effort, nor even

genius. But it required singleness of mind and purpose—a clear vision of that which was immediately in view, and no thought of any kind beyond it.

Probably more nonsense has been written as to Nelson's tactical aims at the Battle of the Nile than about any other act of his life, and for this his flag-captain, afterwards Sir Edward Berry, is primarily responsible. Southey has, however, surpassed himself in misapprehension while painfully wrestling with Berry's 'Narrative.' Let us first quote some of Berry's utterances. He tells us, that—

'The Admiral made the signal to prepare for battle, and that it was his intention to attack the enemy's van and centre, as they lay at anchor and according to the plan before developed. His idea in this disposition of his force was'—(and here we might suppose we were about to get a sight of the master key)—'*first to secure the victory, and then to make the most of it according to circumstances.*'

It would, we suppose, be difficult to produce a sentence more oracularly destitute and void of meaning. Then he goes on:—

'The position of the enemy presented the most formidable obstacles; but the Admiral viewed these with the eye of a seaman determined on attack, and it instantly struck his eager and penetrating mind, that where there was room for an enemy's ships to swing, there was room for one of ours to anchor.'

Sir Edward Berry was a great man of the sword. As a man of the pen his rhetoric got the better of him and succeeded in this sentence in committing him to the assertion that the average naval mind was of such density that it required eagerness and penetration to perceive that where French ships would float, English ships of the same size would float also. But Berry no doubt had an idea which only the entanglement of his literary flourishes kept him from expressing. If any ship designed to pass inside the French line, between it and the shore, there must have been in the mind of her commander an instinctive conception that there was necessarily depth of water to do so, as the French ships required space to swing round their anchors. But Southey, not having the least idea what he was writing about, completely misses the only point which it is possible to imagine was aimed at by Berry, and hazards the following absurd *non sequitur*:—

'The moment he perceived the position of the French, that intuitive genius with which Nelson was endowed displayed itself; and it instantly struck him, that where there was room for an enemy's ship to swing, there was room for one of ours to anchor. *The plan*

which he intended to pursue, therefore, was to keep entirely on the outer side of the French line, and station his ships as far as he was able, one on the outer bow, and another on the outer quarter of each of the enemy's.

It is in company with such puerile absurdities, that the grand simplicity of the Admiral's designs has floated down the stream of time! Happily we do not lack the correction of the master himself to guide us into a right judgement. And first as to his opinion of Berry's 'Narrative' itself. We take it, that if ever a literary effort was concisely damned with faint praise, Nelson's twenty-one words effected that purpose for Sir Edward Berry's. 'The Narrative is well drawn up, and I feel highly sensible of the 'flattering manner in which you have mentioned me.' Before he had seen this 'Narrative,' Nelson had given to Lord Howe the brief but complete statement of his tactical aims which appears at p. 180 of Mr. Laughton's volume and is quoted in his Introduction, and it would almost seem from certain expressions as though he was aware not only that the aims were misunderstood, but that if Berry had understood them the victory would have been even more complete than it was.

'By attacking the enemy's van and centre,' writes Nelson, 'the wind blowing directly along their line, *I was enabled to throw what force I pleased on a few ships.* This plan my friends readily conceived'—not because, as Berry says, every detail had been pre-arranged through a long list of hypothetical cases, but—'by the signals (for which we are principally, if not entirely indebted to your lordship), *and we always kept a superior force to the enemy.* . . . I then pressed further towards the rear; and had it pleased God that I had not been wounded and stone-blind, there cannot be a doubt but that every ship would have been in our possession. But here let it not be supposed that any officer is to blame. No; on my honour I am satisfied each did his very best. I have never before, my lord, detailed the action to any one; but I should have thought it wrong to have kept it from one who is our great master in naval tactics and bravery.'

So that Nelson's effort at the Nile was moral, not intellectual. It is true he made the exact signals, and the only signals, which the calmest reflection after the event tells us were necessary—'Prepare to anchor by the stern,' and 'Attack the enemy's van and centre'; and that if we wish to credit him with profundity we may do so as far as these signals go. But such orders were not the result of profundity, they were the children of simplicity and directness. The two things most plain were, that the French rear might

be left out of action and incapable, and that anchoring by the stern was sure to save many English lives. The genius was not in the intellectual depth which dictated such orders, but in the moral simplicity and directness which trusted to them and went straight on when the sun was going down, and when the whole design had been, so to speak, got up on the spur of the moment. The genius lay in the absence of hesitation, and the impossibility of conceiving that there was any cause for hesitation or delay. And it was precisely the same quality which had made Nelson the year before decline to fight a routine battle in the 'Captain' at St. Vincent.*

The simple and obvious principles put in force at the Nile are embodied in the two celebrated Memoranda, one without date, but supposed by Mr. Laughton to have been penned before August 1804, and the other dated October 9, 1805. The first projected the repetition at sea of precisely the same manœuvre which had been put in practice at the Nile. The plan was to crush, with the whole force of his fleet, the van and centre of the enemy, and to throw the rear out of action. The aim of the second is embodied in a single sentence of its author. 'The whole impression of the British fleet must be 'to overpower from two or three ships ahead of their (the 'enemy's) commander in chief, supposed to be in the centre, 'to the rear of their fleet.' In both Memoranda, the plainest and most obvious methods by which these objects are to be attained are sketched out, and they are neither so vaguely described as to permit of mistake, nor yet so precise as to make a change at the last moment confusing. Thus, while the principle of the Memorandum was fully carried out at Trafalgar, the details were varied, and the signals for bearing down were not those which flag officers and captains had been led to expect. Nelson's tactics were, in fact, the very essence of reasonableness; the very antithesis of deep design. We are unable, now, fully to appreciate the greatness of the conception or the independence of the spirit which adopted it; for we cannot realise the abject condition of the naval mind before his day

* It has struck us as curious that neither Nicolas nor Pettigrew makes mention of the claim put forward by Coleridge ('The Friend,' vol. iii. p. 238, 4th ed.) on behalf of Ball to have been the destroyer of 'L'Orient' with special combustibles. Pettigrew had 'The Friend' in his hands when he wrote, and yet says, 'The cause of the explosion of "L'Orient" has never been satisfactorily stated.'

in all that related to form in fighting a naval battle. But we may be very sure that if there are to be, in the future, commanders who will win great naval victories, they will certainly adopt a system of tactics as simple, as direct, and yet as far removed from mere hazard as those of Lord Nelson.

We have already spoken of the inflexibility and tenacity which Nelson exhibited in the Bay of Naples, and we shall devote a little space to illustrate those attributes, without which some that we have dwelt on would have been sources of weakness rather than of strength. In his earlier life this phase of his character may to lookers on have appeared as mere pertinacity, and could not but have cooled the regards of his friends, and justified the doubts of his superiors. He suffered eternally from the sense of incompleteness, and felt that if there were the smallest item in any undertaking left untouched or unfinished, it were as well that the matter had never been touched at all. The total failure at Teneriffe was not much more difficult to bear than the escape of the 'Généreux' and 'Guillaume Tell' from the Nile. 'We must be contented,' said Hotham, after the capture of the 'Ça Ira' and 'Censeur'; 'we have done very well.' 'Now,' says Nelson, 'had we taken ten sail, and had allowed the eleventh to escape, when it had been possible to have got at her, I could never have called it well done.' The restless sense of the unfinished is ever breaking forth in his letters, and the moments of greatest exultation in success are clouded with the bitterest convictions of failure. It was only eight days after the victory of the Nile that 'no words of his could express what he had been, and was, suffering for want' of frigates. In less than a month he was regretting the escape of the ships, and thinking that, 'if it had pleased God that he had not been wounded, not a boat would have escaped to tell the tale.' Seven days after the extraordinary achievement of Copenhagen, when Nelson, the junior admiral, had been leader, conqueror, and successful ambassador, the exclamation wrung from him by the sense that more might have been done, is—to Lord St. Vincent—'Think for me, my dear lord, and if I have deserved well, let me retire; if ill, for heaven's sake supersede me, for I cannot exist in this state.' And even in his very last utterances, the sense of incompleteness troubled him. 'That's well,' said he, when told that fourteen or fifteen of the enemy had struck; 'that's well! But I bargained for twenty.'

This passionate and insatiable craving for absolute finish is everywhere seen in his acts. It probably could not co-exist with

any powers of analysis or deep reflection, which is very nearly the same thing. And we hold that Nelson's mind was essentially synthetic in its operation. He saw more clearly than any one else what was immediately before him, and he sprang to conclusions which are sufficiently obvious to us after the event, but which could not have been reached at the time by a mind habituated to regard a variety of contingencies operating upon one another, and producing a variable result. The crusade against American traders in the West Indies, which brought him such trouble and annoyance, was but a manifestation of the spirit that compelled him to attack Teneriffe under circumstances which he knew must make success nearly hopeless; and enforced his silence as to the real strength of the garrison at Bastia. Immediately after the Battle of the Nile, Nelson made up his mind that not a man of the French army should ever return to his native country. 'I have little doubt,' he wrote on August 21, 'but that army will be destroyed by plague, pestilence, and famine, and battle and murder, which that it may soon be, God grant.' He never wavered for a moment in that tenacious wish; and on the news of the Treaty of El Arish reaching him, he wrote to Sir William Hamilton (March 30, 1800):—

'If all the wise heads had left them (the French army) to God Almighty, after the bridge was broke, all would have ended well. For I differ entirely with my Commander-in-Chief, in wishing they were permitted to return to France; and likewise with Lord Elgin in the great importance of removing them from Egypt. No; there they should perish, has ever been the firm determination of your Excellency's most obedient and faithful servant.'

The pursuit of the French fleet to Egypt three times, twice with fruitless results, and the last time, in February, 1805, under entire misapprehension, forms again a striking example of Nelson's tenacity of idea and purpose; while that over-haste, which led him to miss Bonaparte the first time, is sufficient to show that, if his conception was keen, it was not wide, and was capable of being clouded by the passion of the moment. Moderate reflection would have told the Admiral, as it must have told a majority of officers in the fleet, that a compact squadron of fourteen ships, even though one of them was jury-rigged, pushing on with all possible speed, would certainly outsail a vast armament including 480 transports, and that it was almost impossible for such a fleet, quitting Malta on June 16th, to be at Alexandria by the 29th. But just as the one idea of the French at Alexandria

had entire and exclusive possession of his mind up to the moment when his eyesight dissipated it, so being gone, it was gone absolutely. Then, when events forced it back again into its old place, it hung there with little or no encouragement, and led him, because he had followed a fleet with a vast military equipment, and had run it down in Egypt in 1798, to imagine that another fleet, with but trifling military equipment, was to be run down on the same spot in 1805. Nor till he met Collingwood off Cadiz, after the return from the great chase to the West Indies and back, is there much sign that Nelson ever gave up the conviction that Villeneuve was ultimately bound eastwards up the Mediterranean. Nothing but such a strong conviction would account for his making for Cape St. Vincent rather than for Ferrol on the return voyage.

But when launched on any of these pursuits, the very unity of his idea became to him like scent to a bloodhound. There was no possibility of turning aside from it so long as the scent was warm. It is simply startling to read in succession Nelson's utterances during his first chase of the French fleet. He seems to gain no rest but by the reiterated announcement of his relentless determination.

'I will fight them the moment I can reach their fleet, be they at anchor or under sail.—I will not lose one moment in fighting the French fleet.—I mean to follow them if they go to the Black Sea!—Not a moment shall be lost in pursuing the enemy.—If their fleet is not moored in as strong a port as Toulon, nothing shall hinder me from attacking them.—I will not lose a moment in bringing them to action.—Not a moment shall be lost in pursuing the enemy and bringing them to action.—I will bring the French fleet to action the moment I can lay hands on them—these pests of the human race!—No time must be lost in destroying the French fleet.'

It is not altogether easy to say, now, in what estimation Nelson was really held by contemporaries who were his equals and superiors in station. The formal official expressions of opinion as to his merits uttered in Parliament, or set out in public documents, appear to us to contain, usually, an undercurrent of apology. It is strikingly remarkable that both Lord Hood and Sir John Jervis should, in the 'Gazette' despatches, have spoken so very slightly of his services under their command. Between the actual facts of Nelson's transcendent and intelligent daring at the Battle of St. Vincent, and Jervis's statement in his letter to Lord Spencer, there is little or no parallelism. Collingwood, and even Berry, are spoken of as at least equally

distinguished with Nelson. Granting a certain angry humiliation, which would not have been an impossible feeling in Jervis's mind, there seems a sort of absence of belief in Nelson which we think we detect very often in contemporary opinion. Even Addington, who goes nearest to expressing a full recognition of the greatness of the admiral, does it as if himself surprised to find greatness there. Nelson must have appeared a somewhat pushing young man to most of his superiors during his earlier days, and if he united the remains of this appearance to the undoubtedly extreme sensitiveness which belonged to his later character, there must always have been certain shrinking from full trust in him, on the part of all his superiors. How could Lord Spencer, for instance, have felt towards the Admiral who wrote to him from the Mediterranean :—

‘Do not, my dear lord, let the Admiralty write harshly to me—my generous soul cannot bear it. . . .’

There must have been a difficulty in admitting real power of mind in one so transparently simple, so unusually child-like. Yet this was but the direct, inartificial outcome of that singleness of idea of which we have spoken. Harsh words hurt him as they hurt the rest of us. He expressed the feeling because nothing but the feeling was present to his mind. We, in our superior wisdom, are possessed of a number of other thoughts and feelings, and when hurt we hold our tongues.

There are no grounds for supposing that many persons, high or low, who became acquainted with Nelson, formed the extraordinary opinion of him expressed by Mrs. St. George (afterwards Trench) during her meetings with him at Dresden in 1800. To her he appeared at first ‘a little ‘man without any dignity,’ and soon after, a coarse and loud inebriate. The long stay at Palermo, the stories carried about of the life which Nelson led there—most of which were not true—very probably had poisoned Mrs. St. George’s mind before she saw the Admiral. The ‘colossal’ proportions of Lady Hamilton, her open flattery of Nelson, and his innocent and delighted reception of it, were not surroundings likely to remove any prejudice she might have formed. But it may be noted that she did not herself see the inebriation and the boorish behaviour which she records against him. The strong probability is that Mrs. St. George was never really told that which she set down. Mr. Elliot may have told her something which, passing through her

prejudice, took the form in which it appeared in her journal. Lady Minto at Vienna heard all the Palermo stories from Mr. Rushout, and such further accounts from Mr. Wyndham as gave her the saddest forebodings. The Queen of Naples, at Leghorn, she writes, was

‘very ill with a sort of convulsive fit, and Nelson was staying there to nurse her; . . . his zeal for the public service seemed entirely lost in his love and vanity, and they all sat and flattered each other all day long.’

But when Nelson presented himself in person at Vienna, the atmosphere of the stories rolled away. Writing to her sister, Lady Malmesbury, she describes the unbounded enthusiasm of the populace for ‘the hero,’ as she was accustomed to call him, and then goes on:—

‘I don’t think him altered in the least. He has the same shock head, and the same honest simple manners; but he is devoted to Emma; he thinks her quite an *angel*, and talks of her as such to her face and behind her back, and she leads him about like a keeper with a bear. . . . He is just the same as ever he was; says he owes everything to Lord Minto; that but for the interest he took about him he should have had no reward for his services in the first action, nor have been placed in a situation to obtain the second.’

The pictures of Nelson at Dresden and at Vienna are not reconcileable. But Lady Minto knew the man well, and Mrs. St. George did not know him at all. It must be allowed that, to the mere spectator, Nelson’s ordinary behaviour in the company of Lady Hamilton would be regarded as an outrage; yet it was an outrage of which neither of them was conscious. We do not believe in the ‘arts’ of Lady Hamilton. It was unfortunate for both of them, that two characters so entirely unsophisticated ever came together, and it is pitiable to read some of the simple, homely, and wifelike letters of the lady who was the chief sufferer in the result. But the joint household at Merton was a heavy trouble to Nelson’s friends. Lord Minto writes of it, on March 22, 1802:—

‘The whole establishment and way of life is such as to make me angry, as well as melancholy; but I cannot alter it, and I do not think myself obliged, or at liberty, to quarrel with him for his weakness, though nothing shall ever induce me to give the smallest countenance to Lady Hamilton. . . . In the meanwhile she and Sir William and the whole set of them are living with him at his expense.* . . . She

* This was a mistake. A number of the weekly housekeeping accounts are now in possession of Mr. A. Morrison. They are jointly
VOL. CLXIV. NO. CCCXXXVI. P P

goes on cramming Nelson with trowelfuls of flattery, which he goes on taking as quietly as a child does pap.'

Little wonder that Lord Minto should sum up his impressions in the sentence: 'He is in many points a really great man, in others a baby.' But whatever the estimate of statesmen, the general public had no doubt at all.

'I met Nelson,' writes Lord Minto in August, 1805, 'in a mob in Piccadilly, and got hold of his arm, so that I was mobbed too. It is really quite affecting to see the wonder and admiration and love and respect of the whole world; and the genuine expression of all these sentiments at once from gentle and simple, the moment he is seen. It is beyond anything represented in a play or a poem of fame.'

What are we to say of a character so widely viewed and so differently spoken of by those who were in contact with it? Our judgement may easily rest upon a broader basis than theirs, and yet as we cannot escape from the influence of the final scene in the 'Victory's' cockpit, it can never be so free from bias. We think, however, that the tendency on the whole has been to lose some of the moral force that was in Nelson, while unduly exalting his intellectual power. We cannot admit that this was great; we hardly allow that deep thought and direct simple aims can exist in the same mind. Certainly, Nelson has left behind him nothing approaching the profound. In two capital instances he was absolutely blind where others saw clearly. He entirely failed to penetrate the designs of the French fleet under Villeneuve, which Collingwood completely unravelled. He showed himself incapable of anticipating the vast importance of Malta, though 'it was the fashion of the day to style 'Egypt the key of India and Malta the key of Egypt;'* and though Lord Minto and Sir Alexander Ball were fully aware of the truth of the adage. No one had greater reason to guess what Malta would become than Nelson, for he had anticipated the overland route in the person of Lieut. Duval. But Toulon was at the time a hostile port; the French were our enemies; and it was impossible for him to withdraw his thoughts from those immediate contingencies. Malta was of no use to Great Britain for the blockade of Toulon; it was therefore useless for any other purpose.

But over all the intellectual shortcomings, hiding with the brightness of its rays the innocent vanities, the unregulated

settled by Sir William and Nelson at the rate of 3,000*l.* or 4,000*l.* a year between them.

* Coleridge.

passions of a childish nature, shines the star of moral grandeur. As we lay down the book we have so far kept in desultory companionship, we say there has not lived another Englishman with such a record of devoted self-sacrifice as that which is shown in its pages. Men of the world may curl the lip at one who had so little in common with them, but our countrymen in general will never cease to feel that the real greatness of Nelson, the real aim and principle of his life, was summed up in his last words. Always in his heart and playing on his lips was the love of king and country. That surmounts and puts aside all that we, in cold judgement, may condemn: and the consciousness that this was so confronted him at the last, and enabled him to leave the world claiming to have done his duty in it.

ART. IX.—*The Irish Question.* By the Right Hon.
W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. London: August, 1886.

AT the time of the appearance of our last number, the great political issue, so momentous for the future of the nation, between union and separation, was in course of decision at the polls; and though we freely expressed our expectation that victory would declare itself for the former, it was not without extreme anxiety that we awaited the result of the crisis. The battle has now been lost and won, the smoke has somewhat cleared away, and it is once more possible to take a survey of the field and to give a thought not merely to present difficulties, but also to the probabilities and the trials of the future.

The result of the general election in the defeat of the policy of the late Prime Minister was generally anticipated by the many thinking men of the Liberal party who were not too much blinded by party passion or too much under the influence of party discipline calmly to estimate the strength of the contending forces. But the expectations even of those most favourable to the union were outdone by the triumphant success which rewarded the efforts they had made to obtain a clear, a decisive, and a final answer from the people of the United Kingdom to the question Mr. Gladstone had asked them, viz. Did they or did they not wish to be governed as one nation? In an evil hour for his fame Mr. Gladstone had announced a policy diametrically opposed to the teaching of his whole political career, and to the express and recent language of himself and almost all his

colleagues. Inconsistency, however, in a popular leader, as the careers of many statesmen and of Mr. Gladstone himself bear witness, by no means always detracts from the enthusiasm of popular support; and what in this case brought ruin to the most popular leader of the age was the instinctive feeling which from the beginning has gone on steadily growing that his policy was an anti-national one, adopted under the stress of party circumstances and in the heat of conflict with political rivals, in the turmoil of which he had forgotten (let us hope it is but for a while) that he, the most powerful British statesman of the day, was not merely the leader of a party or of a faction, large or small, but was the trustee of the honour and the interests of the nation. In consequence of the democratic changes which modern times have made in our institutions, it is far less easy for a statesman now than formerly to run counter to a strong popular instinct and yet retain power in the State. In the time of the American War of Independence and of the Napoleonic wars, political opponents of the Government often expressed sympathy with the national enemy and even pleasure at national disasters. Even then, when wide popular feeling was far less powerful than at present to overcome the pettinesses and the selfishness of private and personal interests unfortunately inseparable from the party game, such sentiments were damaging to the reputation of those who expressed them. But now, when the political business of the nation is conducted in the full blaze of publicity, and the actions and motives of statesmen are subjected to daily criticism, and political power is absolutely dependent upon the support of public opinion, no British statesman who adopts a policy which is in the estimation of his countrymen *anti-patriotic* can hope to retain preponderating influence in public affairs.

Rarely in our history has it been possible for the national verdict to be given so entirely upon a single issue as at the late general election. When a Parliament or an Administration has existed for some time, and a dissolution takes place, it is unavoidable and right that electors should pay almost as much regard to the past conduct of affairs as to the programme the administration puts before them in the hope of obtaining a new lease of power. Even within the same political party rival programmes and divergent views are not unknown; and when the meaning of the elections comes to be interpreted it is often found quite impossible to determine how much electoral support is due to the one programme or the

other. But in the late elections there was no complexity of this kind to render uncertain the voice of the nation. The new Parliament had only just come into existence, and the Administration was even younger than the Parliament. Neither had any past to repent. The real programme of the Prime Minister was made abundantly clear to all men, since it was disclosed in the two bills he had laid before Parliament. The House of Commons had rejected his Irish policy as there defined, and Mr. Gladstone appealed from the House of Commons to the country to support both his bills and himself. How gladly would Liberal electors have responded to his appeal for support had it only been possible to separate *him* from his Irish policy! But this of course could not be. And hundreds of thousands of Liberal electors were forced to the painful decision of denying a support to Mr. Gladstone which they felt could only be given at the sacrifice of their political convictions and at the price of their duty to their country.

Thus the two general elections of November 1885 and July 1886 enable us to estimate much more accurately than is generally possible the strength of feeling of the nation upon one political question. Mr. Gladstone as leader of the Liberal party, appealing to the electors in November with a common-sense Liberal programme, which united all sections of the party, obtained the support of 333 representatives of the constituencies of Great Britain, though the Irish vote was thrown heavily against him. In Ireland, however, owing to his determined stand against those who (he told us) 'wished to march through rapine to the dismemberment' and disintegration of the Empire, he was opposed much more successfully by the Parnellite party, for from one end of that country to the other not a single Liberal member was returned in his support. Some months later Mr. Gladstone meets with a very different response. True, he now has the Nationalist voters enthusiastically on his side. They did but serve to break his fall. Nothing could keep back the strength of the aversion of the great mass of the nation to the policy so suddenly espoused. The same Mr. Gladstone, who, standing by the old principles of the Liberal party, was supported by 333 members, finds himself as the advocate of a separation policy supported but by 186 British representatives at the outside. Even in Ireland there are two Liberals returned who are not Parnellites, and *they* are bitterly opposed to Mr. Gladstone. Never has there been a more sudden revulsion against party leadership; but never

before, it must be remembered, has a party leader so suddenly and so completely reversed his policy, abandoned and turned against his old political friends, and aimed such a blow at the integrity of the nation.

And this was the Gladstonian party, which, on the Separatist cry and with the Irish vote (so party managers and caucus majorities were boasting only last June), would sweep the Unionists from the field! These calculations failed ignominiously, and deserved to fail. But the Irish vote is strong, and in many cases it has obscured in British constituencies the politics of British electors. In Lanarkshire and Glasgow there are thirteen seats, of which seven are filled by Gladstonian, six by Unionist members. In that quarter it is probable that if Scottish electors had been left to themselves they would have told a very different story. And this is but a sample of many districts where, but for the Irish vote, the Unionist ranks would have shown an almost unbroken line. In Wales it is notorious that Mr. Gladstone's supporters owed their success to their advocacy of Disestablishment, a question of course entirely distinct, and about which Unionists, like other Liberals, hold divergent views. Looking back at the end of August to the elections of July, Mr. Gladstone remarks that 'the result has, of course, for the party been disastrous.*' No doubt it has. But the 'of course' comes strangely from the mouth of the statesman who is responsible for the disaster.

It is not always sufficiently borne in mind that the defeat of the Disruption policy, and the consequent fall of Mr. Gladstone, was caused in the main by the dislike, or rather absolute disgust, felt towards it within the ranks of the Liberal party. The Conservatives merely acted in July as they had acted in November and on many previous occasions, in opposing with all their strength the proposed measures of Mr. Gladstone. And that party, which had only a few months before repudiated 'coercion' and thrown over the firm policy of Lord Spencer in order to enlist Parnellite support at the polls, was hardly one in which the public could feel absolute confidence, if it should become possible to maintain a Unionist policy only at the cost of large sacrifices of private interest and personal ambition. The Separatist policy was defeated because the Liberal party as a party would have none of it, and because men of high standing in that party whom the country at large could

* The Irish Question, p. 24.

really trust flung themselves into the fight with a courage and determination which forced upon the most careless of electors the knowledge of the greatness of the issue they were called upon to decide. As often happens, the victory has been won not so much by those who afterwards enjoyed its fruits as by a small band of soldiers vigorously led, which has suffered heavy loss in the fight, but which was prepared at all hazards and at every sacrifice which it might be necessary for them to make to prevent any Government of any party from entering upon a path which could only lead to national disaster and humiliation. The thanks of the country are specially due to Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. John Bright, for their vigorous defence of the unity of the nation, and we do not despair of a time coming when the mass of the Liberal party will recognise that the 'Dissentient Liberals' were its truest friends.

The main feature of the new Parliament is therefore its Unionist character. A very large majority of its members have been returned solely with reference to their pledges to maintain intact the legislative union between the two countries, and we cannot but think that Lord Salisbury's Government made an initial blunder in tactics in not bringing into immediate prominence, by a paragraph in the Queen's Speech, the determination of themselves and of the House of Commons to uphold the decision of the people. When Lord Grey, in 1833, met the Reformed Parliament, there was a strong Repeal party in Ireland and in the House of Commons. The King's Speech invited Parliament to assist him 'in preserving and strengthening the legislative union between the two countries, which with their support and under the blessing of Divine Providence he was determined to maintain by all the means in his power, as indissolubly connected with the peace, security, and welfare of his people.' O'Connell moved an amendment to the Address in 1833 and divided upon it. Would Mr. Gladstone have moved or supported an amendment to the Address, had the Queen's Speech of last August contained a similar paragraph? We doubt it. Had he done so, he would have been defeated by an overwhelming majority; and in either case, whether Mr. Gladstone accepted or declined the challenge, the Government would have vindicated its own position, which is not due to a popular belief that it will produce some specific legislative treatment to cure the ills of Ireland, but to the desire of the nation to be protected against

the Disruption policy with which Mr. Parnell and his allies are threatening it. The Government was in no way required immediately on the assembling of Parliament to develop any novel scheme of Irish policy, and the attempts of Lord Salisbury and Lord Randolph Churchill to sketch out some policy of the kind only added to their difficulties by providing matter for criticism and opportunities for meaningless divisions; whilst, though the views of the Separatists were frequently expressed by Gladstonian members and disputed by Ministers, the House ultimately passed the Address without having once recorded its approval of the principle of the union.

In a retrospect of the last nine months, during which the country has passed through a time of great difficulty and danger, we still see much to be thankful for. When, last December, Mr. Gladstone allowed it to be known that he was a convert to Home Rule, the announcements of his intended policy were so ambiguous, and were denied with so much appearance of authority, that Liberals felt they could not, without manifesting a distrust in their leader—which they were loth to feel—at once take up arms in defence of the union. The wretched exhibition of hesitation and uncertainty in both Houses of Parliament during the debate on the Address last February, whilst Liberal leaders were quibbling as to whether the Act of Union could be rightly described as a ‘fundamental law,’ at a time when they would surely have been far better employed in endeavouring to lead the public out of its then condition of utter perplexity and distrust, was enough to bring dismay into the stoutest minds. But the period of seeming hesitation at last passed away, and the so-called Dissident Liberal leaders stood out as became them, sacrificing without regret place and power to the performance of their public duty, rallying round them an ever-increasing band of followers and a fuller support of public opinion, and at length achieving a victory not the less valuable in their eyes in that it was won not for themselves, but for the nation.

Why is it that some of those who, in England, advocate so keenly the establishment of a separate Parliament and Government for Ireland yet resent the name of Separatist which the public has given them? In old days they would have been called ‘repealers,’ and neither expression would to-day be repudiated by the Nationalist party in Ireland. Indeed, Mr. T. P. O’Connor, now an English member, and President of the Irish National League of Great Britain,

loudly boasted that the Prime Minister was a repealer. 'Mr. Gladstone was to make,' according to Mr. O'Connor, 'three or four speeches during the next few weeks against the union which must seal its doom. If on Thursday next (first reading of the Home Rule Bill) Mr. Gladstone began his speech, by seven o'clock of the same evening the Act of Union would be dead and in its grave, and not all the powers of earth would lift it up to life again.' What Gladstonian Liberals mean by 'true Unionists' other men have always described as Repealers or Separatists, though we can easily believe that as a mere name the former expression sounds best in the ears of British electors. There is nothing new in the attempt for English electioneering and party purposes to get the support of Irish repealers by the use of ambiguous expressions, which in their view can be interpreted in one way, and by English electors, attached to the union, in another. Such tactics are, however, short-sighted as well as dishonest. The demand of a large number of the Irish people for repeal can only be met in one way—by straightforward outspoken honesty on the part of our public men; it cannot be utilised (without sacrificing national interests) for parliamentary or party manœuvring. When, in the autumn of 1844, there appeared to be some prospect of gain to the Whig party if they would but lend a sympathetic ear to the Irish cry for repeal, Lord John Russell wrote a letter to the Duke of Leinster in the true tone which a patriotic statesman should adopt when temptations of a similar kind are appealing to those of the baser sort among his party.

The letter written in September 1844, hitherto unpublished, contains matter so interesting with reference to present Irish policy that no apology is made for here inserting it at length:—

'My dear Duke,—As you are the head of the Whigs in Ireland, I wish you would write to Lord Charlemont and others to beware of countenancing any approach to what is called Federal Union. The union is a fundamental part of our political system. It cannot be compromised or cut into fragments to make repeal more easy to swallow. No man abhors more than I do the breach of faith that has been committed in defrauding Ireland of the fair participation of equal rights. But while I am ready to sacrifice any chance of power or popularity to obtain for Ireland that fair participation, I am determined that, so far as I am concerned, I will stand by the Legislative Union.

'To act otherwise—to let it be supposed that we favoured a Federal Union when we mean no such thing, to gather strength by false pretences, to seem to approve the agitation for Repeal when we have no intention of promoting the objects of the Repealers, would be to act the low or

unworthy part which the present Ministry have played on the question of Free Trade. I trust you will make this intelligible to the Whig party in Ireland. I remain, yours truly,

(Signed) 'J. RUSSELL.'

More than thirty years later Lord Russell had seen no reason to change his views, for he declared that 'Home Rule must be refused in as peremptory a manner as repeal of the union was rejected by Lord Grey and Lord Althorp in 1830.' *

Mr. Gladstone, utterly defeated in the elections and unwilling to test by a Home Rule amendment to the Address the strength of his followers in the House of Commons, has attempted in pamphlet form to give an apology and justification for the reckless policy which has brought so much confusion upon his country and such ruin to his party. In that 'History of an Idea' which forms the first part of his pamphlet, he takes a strange view of the duty of the head of a Cabinet towards colleagues with whom he has been associated perhaps for half a lifetime. He is astounded that Lord Northbrook should complain of his reticence as regards his Irish views before the election of 1885. The public will not share his astonishment. It will seem strange to them that, inasmuch as the Irish Home Rule demands had been pressed upon Parliament for very many years, had constituted one of the main difficulties of carrying on satisfactorily in this country the business of Government and Parliament, and had decided the fate of many elections, Mr. Gladstone should not have allowed even his colleagues to have the least inkling of his 'idea' that all difficulties could be smoothed away by a frank acceptance of the Irish demands. This mystery he attempts to explain in a singularly unsatisfactory history of the question during the past fifteen years, combined with a novel exposition of the true doctrine of 'ripeness.' Mr. Parnell, we are told, had in his speech on the Address in January, 1885, for the first time lowered his terms, and brought his demands in express language within the limits which might constitutionally be entertained by British statesmanship. It was this declaration of the Irish leader that at once made the Home Rule policy ripe. The real test of the propriety of adopting the policy 'was the ripeness or unripeness of the question. 'All men do not perceive, all men do not appreciate ripeness, 'with the same degree of readiness or aptitude; and the

* Lord Russell's 'Recollections and Suggestions.'

‘slow must ever suffer inconvenience in the race of life; but when the subject once was ripe the time for action had come.’* This point having been reached, everything else was simple. Had he not himself declared in the autumn speeches of 1885† that the question of local government in Ireland ‘would probably throw into the shade all the important measures which in his address he had set out as ripe for action; that it would go down to the very roots and foundations of our whole civil and political constitution?’ and had he not denounced ‘Woe to the man who should prevent or retard the consummation?’ Could anything be more consistent? Let us examine the facts. In the first place, Mr. Parnell’s speech, so much lauded for its moderation, did not precede but followed Mr. Gladstone’s acceptance of the Home Rule policy. It was in December that, on his own showing, Mr. Gladstone had seen the necessity for a new departure in Irish politics. It was on January 21 that Mr. Gladstone, as leader of the Opposition, following the speeches of the mover and seconder of the Address, conveyed to even the densest of his hearers the knowledge that those rumours so often half-authoritatively denied were true in fact, and that the leader of the Liberal party had for the preceding two months been a convert to the principle of Home Rule. The welcome that this speech received from the Home Rule benches showed that Irish members fully understood the importance to their cause of their new recruit. It was under these circumstances that later in the same evening Mr. Parnell rose. Was this a moment that Mr. Parnell would select to repeat his old phrases of never resting till the last link was destroyed which united Ireland to Great Britain, or of insisting that it was a separate and independent, and may be hostile nation, which many Irishmen wished to create? Mr. Parnell is no fool. He welcomed Mr. Gladstone with open arms; but the moderation of his tone was the consequence and not the cause of Mr. Gladstone’s surrender. And to what after all did Mr. Parnell’s moderation amount? His tone was no doubt different from that in which he has often spoken in this country, and even in the House of Commons; but did he, for practical purposes, abate one jot of the well-known demands of himself and his friends for a separate Parliament and Executive in Ireland? For more, at all events in the House of Commons, he could not ask. Let us be just to Mr. Parnell, and give him credit for the virtues

* The Irish Question, p. 22.

† Ibid. p. 20.

not too common among politicians of absolute consistency and firmness of purpose. In the next place, *was* the question really 'ripe'? Mr. Gladstone tells us himself that 'twelve months ago it was almost as foreign to the British mind as the differential calculus.' A policy so strange and so 'foreign' in August 1885 had ripened by the end of December, we suppose under the genial influence of the general election, in the mind of the late Prime Minister. But 'the British mind' throughout that general election was mainly addressed by Liberal leaders and Liberal candidates in words of denunciation of the outrageous conduct, and warning against the preposterous demands, of Mr. Parnell and his friends. The truth is that neither time nor opportunity had been afforded to the British mind for ripening on the Home Rule policy. Indeed the very word 'ripening,' drawn from the sure but somewhat slow processes of Nature, is unapt to describe that rapid and almost miraculous change of opinion in which so great a multitude of converts have found salvation? The doctrine of ripeness when so understood is but the doctrine of political opportunism; and what a melancholy contrast does Mr. Gladstone's eulogy of that form of statesmanship bear to the lessons to be learned from leaders of Liberal opinion in the past—Lord Grey, Lord John Russell, and Mr. Bright!

Leaving Mr. Gladstone's apology, it is time to turn to what is far more important, the position he intends to take up towards the burning question of the day. He does not seem, if his pamphlet is to be taken as a contribution to the practical discussion of the difficulties of the present situation, to have realised the conditions of the problem which is waiting for solution. After the verdict which the constituencies have just given, any Government, however composed, will have to govern Ireland as an integral part of the United Kingdom. During the present Parliament, at all events, whether the British public was right or wrong in its decision, Ireland will necessarily be governed upon the basis of the maintenance of the legislative union. The Dissident Liberals, whether more or less than two-sevenths of the party, have been strong enough to decide that question. Mr. Gladstone, indeed, thinks that the schism has had something of a privileged-class flavour about it; for 'he fears' that the schismatics are more numerous among peers than among working men, and among Liberal employers of labour than among those they employ. But why the question of national unity should be a class one, or why, if it were, such

strong verdicts should be given in its favour by democratic constituencies, we are not informed. Whether or not, however, Mr. Gladstone's policy is one which can be practically carried out at the present time, it is important with a view to future contingencies to ascertain what is its real drift and meaning. Incredible as it may seem, Mr. Gladstone is not content with his scheme for repealing the parliamentary union between Great Britain and Ireland, but he must needs also advocate a system of separate Parliaments for England and Scotland and even Wales, for 'the fact that the latter country has been from the first under an incorporating union has blinded us to the fact that there are within the United Kingdom no less than four nationalities.' The union of these 'nationalities,' which we had supposed all good subjects rejoiced in thinking (as regards three of them) absolute and complete, 'is not,' we are informed, 'a partnership of three kingdoms, or of four nationalities upon equal terms. The vast preponderance of one among them enables her to overbear the other three and to reverse their combined judgement.' True the subject nations had not writhed under, for they had not discovered, their own subjection; but now that 'nationality' has become 'an element of our political thought,' we may hope their thoughts will wake to better things.

'Should there be—and will there not be?—questions coming forward in which Scotland or Wales have a special national interest or feeling, it is probable that Ireland, so long at least as she continues to have a voice through her members in British affairs, will reciprocate the boon' (the support given by a majority of Scotch and Welsh members to Irish nationality). 'What is not less likely and even more important is that the sense of nationality, both in Scotland and in Wales, set astir by this controversy, may take a wider range than heretofore. Wales, and even Scotland, may ask herself whether the present system of entrusting their affairs to the handling of a body, English in such overwhelming proportions as the present Parliament is, and must probably always be, is an adjustment which does the fullest justice to what is separate and specific in their several populations. Scotland, which for a century and a quarter after her union was refused all taste of a real representative system,* may begin to ask herself whether, if at the first she felt something of an unreasoning antipathy, she may not latterly have drifted into a superstitious worship, or at least an irreflective acquiescence. . . . The desire for federation floating

* The Scotch system of representation was what it was solely by virtue of Scotch law and custom. It is not the case that the effect of the union was to narrow or keep restricted the Scotch representative system.

in the minds of many has had an unexpected ally in the Irish policy of 1886; and if the thing which that term implies contains within itself possibilities of practical good, the chance of bringing such possibilities to bear fruit has then been unexpectedly and largely improved' (p. 36).

Could anything be more mischievous than the tone and the suggestions of these words? Against England are to be united the sentiments of 'dear old Scotland,' of 'gallant 'Wales,' and of Ireland, 'the moderation of whose demands 'are brightly reflected in the calm, confiding, and constitutional attitude of the nation.' Such a combination, it is hoped, with the alliance of a minority of English members, will be able to convert the constitution of this kingdom into a combination of federated States. We know what Mr. Gladstone means by giving autonomy to Ireland. The absolute separation of the Parliaments and Executive Governments of the two islands, and the conversion of the smaller one into a species of semi-independent and yet tributary State. Can any serious statesman propose to sever in a similar fashion the Parliaments and Governments of Scotland and Wales from that of England? Are we shown any reason for believing that the country as a whole would be better governed, that better laws would be passed, or that they would be better administered under such a system than under the rule of a single and sovereign Parliament? Nothing of the kind is attempted, and Mr. Gladstone contents himself with pointing out in justification of this portentous proposal that the majority of English members against the Home Rule Irish policy outweighs the majorities of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales in favour of it. Well, what then? As to many measures of first-class importance which have been carried by the Liberal party in the past, the majority of English members has been outvoted by the majorities of the Scotch, Irish, and Welsh members who have turned the balance against them. Who ever thought of arguing from this in favour of federation? Looked at in the light of history, the proposal to revive or create four distinct nationalities is almost absurd. What claim has Wales to be considered a distinct nation? Certainly no more than the highlanders of Scotland. In Wales, as in the Scotch highlands, the old race and the majority of the present population are of a different breed from the rest of the British people. But neither Wales nor the Scottish highlanders, nor for that matter Ireland either, ever was supposed to constitute a nation by any other nation

of the earth. As regards the kingdom of Scotland the case was different. The Scotch people, composed of two different races, formed a distinct independent nation, recognised as such not only by England but by all the Powers of Europe. They sent out, and they received ambassadors. They formed alliances with continental nations quite irrespective of, and indeed generally opposed to, English wishes and interests. Internally, also, there existed all the marks of independent 'nationhood.' The Scotch had their own monarchs, their own Parliament, their own judicature and system of laws, their own Church establishment, their own universities, their own army and navy. Whether in their foreign relations or in their internal administration, the Scotch people were as independent and distinct a nation as the English themselves, with whom at last they became so happily united. The result of the unions of 1603 and 1707 between England and Scotland, of course, necessarily involved the sacrifice of their separate existence, and the latter union could not have been accomplished had not the strong good sense of the Scotch people overpowered those natural but not very wise sentiments which the Jacobite party for its own purposes did its best to inflame. At the present day Scotchmen and Englishmen have one common sentiment of patriotism for their common country. Hitherto the policy of Liberal statesmen has been, by just and considerate treatment, to enable Irishmen to feel that they also are British citizens, enjoying all their rights, sharing all their privileges, bearing their share of the same burdens, and proud to be a portion of the same great powerful nation. Hundreds of thousands of Irishmen of course do feel this. Patience and firmness of purpose will yet, let us hope, give this policy success, and 'woe be to the man who should prevent or retard the consummation!'

It is a gross mistake to suppose that the smaller nations are less interested than the larger one in the completeness of the union. Were Ireland and Scotland each to have its own Parliament to 'manage its own affairs,' England of course would be similarly treated. Now though we do not agree with, we understand the view that the laws and government of Scotland (say) do not concern the English people, or, to speak more accurately, that portion of the British people which lives in England. But the counter-proposition, that it is of no importance to Scotchmen how people in England are governed, and that they, because they are Scotchmen, are not to meddle with the laws and

government prevailing over the greater portion of this island, is clearly opposed to common sense. The citizen of Edinburgh or Glasgow has in general far more intimate relations with England than he has with the highlands of his own country. The same reasoning is applicable to Ireland. As facilities of travel increase, and education spreads, men transfer themselves more easily to places where work or other advantages are to be had, quite irrespective of 'national' borders. A very large Welsh population inhabits Liverpool, a large part of the Irish people lives in Great Britain, Scotchmen are to be found in all parts of the United Kingdom. The very progress of civilisation makes for the unity of the nation and drives into the background the old distinctions of locality.

Had anyone but Mr. Gladstone advocated federation—for that and nothing else is the clear meaning of his pamphlet—for the four nationalities into which he says the United Kingdom is divided, we should not have thought the suggestion worthy of serious notice in these pages. But Mr. Gladstone is leader of a powerful party, not a few among whom have lately shown that for them his word is law as to the political path which they think it their duty to tread. Even these, let us hope, will attempt to realise that what is involved in this proposal so lightly and carelessly made is the abandonment of a Constitution in which the absolute sovereignty of our own Parliament is the main characteristic for a Constitution whose basis is to be the equal treatment of four distinct nationalities. Where is the ultimate power to reside? If there is to be one supreme Parliament, and four local subject Parliaments, how can it be avoided that in the first the voice of England will assert itself more powerfully than that of Scotland and Ireland? In such a case the superior authority of England will be exerted in a manner far more offensive than at present, and there would be some excuse for that jealousy of feeling which now in this island can hardly be said to exist. If, on the other hand, the local Parliaments—i.e. the Parliaments of Scotland and Ireland and Wales—are not to be entirely subject Parliaments, their rights must be protected against the authority of the Supreme Legislature. That is, we must have recourse to a fixed written Constitution, and a tribunal with authority to check and overrule the action even of the Supreme Legislature itself. The probable working of four separate Executive Governments, each independent of the other, and each dependent upon its own 'national' Legislature, the more we consider

it, seems to involve greater and greater difficulties, and to give greatly increased opportunities for the creation of 'national' friction. And yet 'federation,' if in Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet it means anything, means the establishment of four such Legislatures and four such Executive Governments. It is no mere matter of decentralisation, or of remitting to local authorities the administration of matters with which they are competent to deal, as has been done so usefully with regard to the municipal government of towns; 'federation' is something absolutely different from this: it means the construction of an absolutely new Constitution, and the reversal of most of the political ideas which for many centuries the British people have cherished.

It is not to be wondered at that, Mr. Gladstone having brought into the strife of party politics so fundamental a question as that affecting the unity of the nation, party divisions and relations both in and out of the House of Commons should exhibit a state of confusion without parallel in our recent history. The House of Commons, no longer divided into its two historic parties, is made up of no fewer than four groups, each with its own leaders, its own party organisation and head-quarters outside Parliament, and its own 'whips' within the House. Even the Conservative party, far the largest of the four sections, does not number, though it very nearly reaches, a majority of the House of Commons. The Liberal Unionist members may be taken at from 75 to 80, and the whole Unionist vote together at very little short of 400. The Gladstonian or Separatist * Liberals fall short of the Unionists by some 200 votes, whilst the Parnellites, whose Irish policy they have adopted, can bring 83 men into the lobby. This state of things can hardly last against what seems to be the natural tendency, at all events of *British* politics, to become divided throughout the country as well as Parliament into *two* parties, each of them no doubt including within itself a certain amount of difference of political opinion, which, however, is not strong enough to prevent joint action to secure the general and approved objects which each party has at heart. Till party politics

* We cannot help employing the term 'Separatist,' *pace* Sir Charles Russell, as a convenient description of a party which advocates the establishment of a separate Parliament and Government in Ireland. The Unionist, on the other hand, takes his stand on the principal clause of the Act of Union—that establishing one parliament for both countries.

have begun to 'settle down,' we fear it is almost hopeless to expect that condition of firm government accompanied with steady political progress for which the country is yearning. There is something unhealthy in the spasmodic energy with which, on occasions, subjects of political interest are taken up by statesmen and the public. Political life should not be a prolonged 'agitation;' let us get back, if possible, to a condition of steadier and therefore more healthy activity.

The altered character, however, of the new House of Commons cannot be fully understood by merely enquiring into the numbers composing its various sections. Lord Randolph Churchill, as leader of the House, and Mr. Henry Matthews, as Secretary of State for Home Affairs, form an arrangement which but a very few months ago would have appeared to the best-informed members of either party no less impossible than absurd. The Secretary of State, though he had sat in the House of Commons many years ago, was, when he received his appointment, practically quite unknown to public life; and even by members of his own profession, whilst universally recognised as a man of exceptional ability, he had never been considered as quite in the front rank amongst leaders of the bar. Lord Randolph Churchill had made his position in the Parliament of 1880, as the leader of the notorious Fourth Party, a select band whose sole object appeared to be to thwart Mr. Gladstone's Government, almost without regard either to the merits of its measures or the interests of the country. If in Egyptian or other foreign complications a question could be put, the answering or not answering of which would add to the difficulties of the Government, the sense of responsibility which restrained the colleagues of Sir Stafford Northcote was no hindrance to the unpatriotic curiosity of the front bench below the gangway. In the weary and protracted Bradlaugh disputes, which did so much to lower the dignity of the House of Commons, Lord Randolph Churchill, Sir Henry Wolff and Mr. Gorst posed in an especial degree, to the astonishment of their friends, as the champions of true religion against the atheistic and revolutionary Government of Mr. Gladstone. The great weapon of the Fourth Party was obstruction, and it cannot be denied that it was wielded with some success. In the recklessness of their action it sometimes happened that Lord Randolph and his friends found themselves in bitter antagonism to the Conservative chiefs. But, distrusted as he was on his own side of the

House, and ridiculed on the other rather as a mischievous obstructive than a rising statesman, Lord Randolph had on many occasions given evidence of two qualities, the possession of which is essential to parliamentary success. He was marvellously ready in debate, and he was absolutely without fear, being deterred neither by awe of the Liberal leaders nor by the thought of being left in the lurch by his friends. These qualities stood him in good stead at a time when the Conservative chiefs appeared to be weighed down by their sense of inferiority to the great orator opposed to them. Readiness and courage, however, have not hitherto been the sum total of qualities requisite to make a good Chancellor of the Exchequer and a successful leader of the House of Commons, and Lord Randolph's reckless disregard of everything but the factious desire to injure Mr. Gladstone's Government, and his readiness to combine with Mr. Parnell's followers in order to eject that Government from office, have not been forgotten, and undoubtedly have greatly weakened the position which the leader of the House ought to hold in the public estimation. It is by one of Lord Randolph's predecessors in the lead of a party that we are told that 'there are qualities which govern men, such as sincerity and a conviction on the part of his hearers that the Minister is a man to be trusted, which have more to do with influence over the House of Commons than the most brilliant flights of fancy and the keenest wit.' *

It must nevertheless in fairness be admitted that Lord Randolph's management of the House of Commons during the late session has done much to strengthen the belief of his friends in his capacity for leadership, and to justify the hope that the great responsibility of his position will give new steadiness of character to his political action.

The change that has taken place on the Liberal front bench is no less remarkable, though it is less conspicuous, than that on the bench opposite. On the former indeed, for the most part, the men are the same. Mr. Gladstone and Lord Hartington, Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Wm. Harcourt, Sir Henry James and Mr. Morley sit side by side; as we believe in 1846 Sir Robert Peel and Lord George Bentinck from the same bench faced the Government of Lord John Russell. In the old House of Commons which was burnt down in 1834, there were several rows of cross benches on which sat members who professed to be inde-

* Lord Russell's 'Recollections and Suggestions.'

pendent of party, and to judge of measures on their abstract merits, and it was from these that Mr. Stanley (the late Lord Derby) made his famous thimble-rig speech. In the existing House seats must be taken on the right or the left of the Speaker, and there are no seats specially allotted to independent members. Had Lord Hartington and his friends taken their seats on the Government side of the House, it would have been thought by the public that they were giving up their position of party leaders, and this would have undoubtedly diminished their influence with Liberal electors; for it has not been the object of Liberal Unionists or of their leaders merely to throw additional weight into the Conservative scale.

In the recent unsettled condition of public affairs the country has had great reason to congratulate itself on the public spirit and self-denying conduct of two of its most eminent statesmen. At a time when Englishmen found their faith shaken almost to its foundations in too many of the statesmen to whom they had previously looked up; when one after another prominent politicians were hastening to forget their most recent speeches, and were outdoing each other in the rapidity of their conversion to a policy which they had only just ceased to denounce, Lord Hartington and Lord Salisbury have been able to set a much-needed example, and show that for them at all events politics is something more than a game of party rivalry or personal ambition. Lord Salisbury's offer, on Mr. Gladstone's resignation, to stand aside and give every assistance in his power to Lord Hartington in the formation and support of a new Government, was evidently made in sincerity and good faith. Lord Hartington, with the able men who have been associated with him, and with the co-operation in and out of office of the strongest members of the Conservative party, might have formed an Administration, powerful from the abilities of its members, which at least for a time would have commanded the confidence of the country. The offer so honourably and patriotically made was as honourably and patriotically declined, and Lord Hartington, just before the meeting of Parliament, gave to the Liberal Unionist members assembled at Devonshire House reasons which should surely have satisfied most men of the wisdom as well as the patriotism of his decision. The offer could not have been accepted without very greatly weakening the power of Lord Hartington and his Unionist friends to carry out that line of conduct which in their opinion was the one best calculated to

serve the interests of the State, and most conducive to the ultimate success of the Unionist cause. Lord Hartington pointed out that the Liberal Unionists now held a position perhaps of little advantage to themselves, but of great and almost decisive political influence; for whilst they could prevent a Conservative Government from adopting a retrograde course, or from taking steps dangerous to the welfare of the country, either with regard to foreign policy or unsound domestic legislation, they could 'prevent the return 'to power of a Liberal Government committed to the disruption of the Empire.' And he laid it down as

'the duty of the Liberal Unionists to maintain their position and remain united as a security against the policy of Disruption, and as a basis for the reconstruction of a sound Liberal policy on principles consistent with the integrity of the Empire. All questions, whether distinctly Irish or involving the existence of the Government, were to be looked at from this point of view, and they would not surrender to Mr. Gladstone or his colleagues the right of exercising their independent judgement upon them. They had sacrificed much and risked much when their party was in power for a great object, and now they were in Opposition they would not stultify themselves by supporting a policy which would lead to a renewal of proposals which had been successfully resisted under more favourable circumstances.'

This language, unanimously approved at the time by Unionist members, has since been repeated by some of them in the House of Commons, and by no one with so much force and effect as by Mr. Chamberlain.

There are thus two great objects which the Liberal Unionist party has to keep in view. Its first duty is to prevent *any* party which adopts a policy of Disruption holding power. Its second object is the reconstruction of the Liberal party. It has been thought in some quarters that these aims are somewhat inconsistent, and that the best means of preventing the return to power of a Separatist party would be through Lord Hartington and his followers merging themselves in the Conservative ranks. With this view we entirely disagree. Such a line of action would, in the first place, identify, possibly permanently, the cause of the Liberal party and of the present Opposition with the Separatist policy, now much more indissolubly connected with the personality of Mr. Gladstone than with the creed of any political party. For the Liberal Unionists to have quitted the strong position they now occupy, and to have allowed the Separatist majority to arrogate to itself the heirship of the great Liberal party, would have been a fatal error of tactics,

and would have inflicted a heavy blow on the Unionist cause. There is, moreover, another reason constantly present to the minds of Liberal Unionists. Can they wholly trust the Conservative party, or rather all the Conservative leaders, on this question? At the general election, on the whole, the Conservatives and the Liberal Unionist electors performed in an honourable spirit the difficult task advised by their leaders of subjecting individual preferences and former prejudices to the duty of defending the Union. It must be remembered, however, that whilst the Liberal Unionists were 'Dissentients,' and were for the sake of a great national object taking a line of action opposed for the time to the interest of themselves and their party, the same test of sincerity was not from the nature of the case present to prove the steadfastness of their Conservative allies. Lord Randolph Churchill and Mr. Matthews, for instance, may be just as true Unionists as Lord Hartington, Sir Henry James, Sir George Trevelyan, and other Liberals, but they have not yet had an opportunity of proving it. The support of eighty-six votes in the House of Commons is a temptation which may try sorely, at some future period, the virtue of the Conservative party. Is it certain that from temptation against which Sir William Harcourt's virtue is not proof, Lord Randolph Churchill would escape unscathed? It would be foolish to pretend that Liberal Unionists feel implicit confidence in all the Conservative leaders. On the contrary, the full strength of the Unionist position consists not merely in their ability to keep out of office any Separatist Liberal Government, but also in their ability to check their Conservative allies in any tendency they may exhibit to undue coquetting with the Parnellite vote. For the present the Liberal Unionists have enough to occupy them in the performance of their first duty—the maintenance of the Parliamentary Union. The reconstruction of the Liberal party will we fear be a work which requires time; and, to judge by present appearances, that party will yet have to undergo further discomfiture before the process of welding it together again can well begin. One thing is certain—viz. that the great Liberal party cannot be reconstructed upon purely Parnellite lines, and that it cannot be led except by men who enjoy the confidence and respect of the public. It is lamentable that, owing to internal dissensions, a party which might have among its leaders Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen, Mr. Chamberlain and Sir George Trevelyan, should have been, even for a time, com-

manded by Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Labouchere. And what, since August, has been the action of Gladstonian Liberals? During Mr. Gladstone's absence on the Continent, the Government had to encounter the most persistent and prolonged obstruction. The debate on the Address, though carried to an inordinate length, did not exhaust the energies of Irish members, who, with a few confederates, have again been doing their best to degrade the House of Commons in the public estimation. During the past four or five weeks there has been no real Liberal Opposition. Mr. Parnell has virtually taken the position of Opposition leader upon himself, and Gladstonian Liberals have been content to play the part of humble auxiliaries in a campaign planned by Mr. Parnell, whose forces from time to time they obligingly swell. Of the large number of divisions that have been taken during the session only two can be considered of any importance. The first was on Mr. Parnell's amendment to the Address, on which occasion Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt urged on their followers to vote for Mr. Parnell, though they themselves intended to be absent; the second was on the second reading of Mr. Parnell's bill, which implies the severest censure that has yet been passed on the principle of Mr. Gladstone's Land Act of 1881. On the former occasion nearly one hundred Gladstonians, including most of the ex-officials under Cabinet rank, supported Mr. Parnell. On the latter occasion Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues were able to lead into the Parnellite lobby some 120 of their followers. In almost every other division of the forty-six which have taken place, the Gladstonians, though supporting the Parnellites, have formed the minority of the Opposition. But whether in the principal divisions of the session or in the minor ones, it is worth noticing that Mr. Parnell and his lieutenants, not Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt, have in fact been the leaders of Opposition.

The prospect for next session cannot but be an anxious one. If eighty-six members choose deliberately to obstruct Supply, the business of the country cannot be carried on without the majority of the House of Commons asserting its strength and reducing them to order. This sooner or later it must be prepared to do. There is reason to fear that Parnellite obstruction may find encouragement and countenance from a portion of the Gladstonian Liberals, some of whom, not content with the damage and discredit they have brought upon their party by associating it with the policy of Disruption of the Empire, will be ready to complete their

wretched work by identifying it also with the cause of disorder in the House of Commons. The battle of order against disorder has nevertheless to be fought out, and the sooner the better for the credit of Parliament.

The mandate given to the present House of Commons by the country is a very clear and simple one. It is to govern Ireland, through the Imperial Parliament, as a part of the United Kingdom. In order to do this, the House of Commons must regain control of its own affairs, and possession of its own time, from those who have avowedly been endeavouring to weaken and degrade the institutions of the country, and from those whose egotism and vanity make them treat the House of Commons as a vantage-ground on which they may obtain notoriety, in absolute disregard of the general interest of members and the business of the House.

The Parnellite design of extorting Home Rule by the mere worrying of the House of Commons has been blown to the winds by the result of the general election. Electors will remember, even should Members of Parliament forget it, the saying of Lord Palmerston: 'If we give way to what is wrong for the sake of having an easy life, we shall end by having a life without a moment's ease.' For the present Parliament, the question of Home Rule has been decided; and the principal work for our statesmen will be to restore order and business habits to the House of Commons.

INDEX.

A

- Alford, Lady Marian*, her work on Needlework as Art reviewed, 137.
Arabian Nights, the, review of the versions of Galland, Edward W. Lane, John Payne, and others, 166—Caussin de Perceval's edition of Galland's version, 167—Torrens's and Lane's translations, 171—Captain Burton's version, 176, 180—Mr. Payne's translation, 176—origin of the tales, 185—their value as a picture of Moslem life and manners, 192—love as their universal theme, 193—Haroun er-Raschid, 196—the Barber and his brothers, 197.
Arnold, Matthew, his work on German Universities reviewed, 241.
Aurora Borealis, the, review of works by Mr. Capron and others upon, 416—earliest records of its observation in England, 418—intermittent occurrence of the phenomenon, 420—Halley's magnetic hypothesis, 421—auroral arches, 422—'streamers,' 423—the 'draped aurora,' 424—zone of distribution of, 425—its annual periodicity, 427—its electrical origin, 430—alleged auroral sounds, 432—an aéronaut's observation, 437—relation of clouds to auroræ, 438—estimates of distance of, 439—spectrum of, 443—feeble photographic power of, 445—definition of the polar aurora, 446.

B

- Boeckh, Aug.*, his 'Corpus Inscriptionum Græcarum' reviewed, 268.
Bright, John, his speech at Birmingham on Home Rule reviewed, 284.
Brown, Charles Armitage, the friend of Keats, note on, 299.

C

- Cambridge*, the Architectural History of the University and Colleges of, review of Professor Willis's work on, 382—relation of the collegiate to the monastic system, 383, 396—the Gothic revival, 387—costly buildings, 390—Italianising mania, 392—quadrangular plan of colleges, 398—chapel of Pembroke College, 400—castellated edifices, 401—King's College chapel, 402—an architectural phenomenon, 405—Queens' College, 407—Jesus College and its cruciform chapel, 408—St. John's and Trinity, 409—the component parts of a college, 410—style of collegiate buildings, 414.
Capron, J. R., review of his work on Auroræ, 416.
Chamberlain, J., his election address at Birmingham reviewed, 284.
Chesterfield, the Earl of, his Administration of Ireland, 447.
Clark, J. W., his edition of Prof. Willis's work on the 'Architectural History of Cambridge' reviewed, 382.
Conrad, Dr., his work on the German Universities reviewed, 241.
Curtis, John, his work on Farm Insects reviewed, 353.

D

- Davout, Marshal*, review of M. de Mazade's edition of the correspondence of, 199—his early years, 200—his introduction to Napoleon, 201—he marries a relative of Bonaparte, 202—he advises the establishment of the Empire, 203—his part in the German campaigns, 204—battle of Eylau, 205—his occupation of Poland, 206—preparations for war with Austria, 208—his modest report of the battle of Wagram, 209—Russian campaign, 211—Davout's defence of Hamburg, 214—his work during the Hundred Days, 217—his death, 218.
- Dawson, Capt. H. P.*, his observations on the Magnetic Pole reviewed, 416.
- Drummond, Thomas*, his memoir by J. F. MacLennan reviewed, 447.

E

- Election, the General*, review of the addresses of Messrs. Gladstone and Chamberlain, the Marquis of Hartington, and Mr. John Bright, 284—issue before the country: Union or Disruption, 284—the Gladstone-Parnellite alliance, 286—secession of the Whig leaders from the Cabinet, 290—Mr. Macaulay on Repeal, 292—Earl Russell on the government of Ireland, 295—American support of Irish agitation, 297—the political outlook, 298.
- England*, since 1815, review of Mr. Walpole's History of, 513—Peel and the Conservative party, 513—distress in 1841 in, 515—the Chartists, 516—Peel's administration, 517—Irish Repeal movement, 520—estimate of Peel's policy, 522—Ecclesiastical Commission created, 525—Tractarian movement, 526—relations with France under Peel, 527—the Spanish Marriages, 528—Lord Palmerston's foreign policy, 530—Crimean War, 532—present relations with Russia, 536—British rule in India, 538—the Colonies, 541.

F

- Fennell, C. A. M.*, his translation of Professor Michaelis' work on Ancient Marbles in Great Britain reviewed, 484.
- Forman, H. Buxton*, his edition of Shelley's works reviewed, 42.
- France*, the Third Invasion of, review of M. Véron's work on, 301—effective strength of the French army in 1870, 303—its insufficient equipment, 304—Germany prepared for the struggle, 306—the French plan of the campaign, 307—Von Moltke's counter-plan, 308—German victories, 309—inaction of Bazaine, 310—conflicting counsels of the Emperor and of Bazaine, 312—the marshal's indecision, 313—battle of St. Privat, 318—battle of Noisseville, 324—Bazaine decides on remaining in Metz, 326—the Sedan disaster, 326—Bazaine's communications with the Germans, 328—Republic proclaimed in Paris, 329—the Regnier incident, 330—General Boyer's mission, 333—Bazaine's explanation of his inactivity, 337—capitulation of Metz, 344—judgement of the conduct of Bazaine, 352.
- Frary, Raoul*, his work on Latin at the Universities reviewed, 241.
- Fritz, Hermann*, his works on the Aurora Borealis reviewed, 416.

G

- Galland, A.*, his version of the 'Arabian Nights' reviewed, 166.
Geology, review of Professor Prestwich's work on, 219—researches of William Smith, 219—Sir Charles Lyell, 220—two schools of geologists, 220—qualifications necessary for a geological student, 222—The Tors of Devon and Cornwall, 223—Professor Prestwich on denudation, 224—estimates of geological time, 225—excavation of river valleys, 225—limestone rocks, 227—the 'Challenger' deep-sea discoveries, 230—depth of the ocean, 231—ocean currents, 232—meteorological agencies, 233—ice action, 234—volcanoes, 235—coral reefs, 237—classification in geological zoology, 239.
Goschen, G. J., his address on the Prospects of Trade reviewed, 1.
Gladstone, W. E., his election addresses in Midlothian reviewed, 284—his pamphlet on the Irish question reviewed, 575.

H

- Hansard, L.*, his address on the Prices of Commodities reviewed, 1.
Hartington, Marquis of, election address at Rosendale reviewed, 284.
Hübner, Baron von, his 'Through the British Empire' reviewed, 73.

I

- Ignatius and Polycarp, SS.*, review of Bishop Lightfoot's edition of their writings, 100—story of the martyrdom of Ignatius, 102—its credibility discussed, 104—the story corroborated by Lucian's satires, 112, 121—the Ignatian epistles: which of them are genuine? 113—three forms of the epistles: the Middle, the Long, and the Short, 114—discovery of a Syriac version, 119—the Short and the Long recensions rejected, 125—Polycarp's epistle adduced in evidence, 121, 126—authenticity of the Middle form established, 130—comparison of Polycarp with Ignatius, 132.
Insects, review of works by Miss Ormerod, Messrs. Lintner and Curtis, and others upon, 353—devastation caused by, 353—estimates of the consequent money losses, 356—importance of the study of insect life, 359—chief insect foes of the farmer, 361—the *Phylloxera*, 364—its life-stages, 366—its habitat, 367—measures taken for its destruction in France, 370—its ravages in Continental vineyards, 375—national organisation for defence against such plagues, 379—immense fecundity of the aphid, 380—insect activity of Panama, 381.
Ireland, review of works of Arthur Young and others upon, 447—unfairness of critics towards English government of, 448—circumstances of the Penal Laws, 449—a long period of tranquillity in, 451—Chesterfield's administration, 453—Arthur Young's description of, 458—events preceding the Union, 463—persons engaged in the accomplishment of the Union, 465—Ordnance Survey of, 469—famine relief and the Poor Law, 471—rejection of proposal for abolition of the Lord Lieutenancy, 473—Phoenix conspiracy, 474—Fenian movement, 476—Sir T. Larcom on abolishing Dublin Castle, 478—Encumbered Estates Act, 480—'National Education,'

481—changes effected by United Parliament, 482—Mr. Gladstone's attempted justification of his Home Rule scheme, 582.

Irish Question, the, review of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet upon, 575—Unionist character of the new Parliament, 579—Lord John Russell on Repeal, 581—Mr. Gladstone's apology for his Home Rule scheme, 582—extension of the scheme to England, Scotland, and Wales, 585—division of parties upon the question, 589—objects of the Liberal Unionists, 593—duty of the new Parliament towards Ireland, 596.

L

Lane, Edward William, his 'Arabian Nights' reviewed, 166.

Laughton, J. K., his selection of Nelson's letters reviewed, 542.

Letronne, A. J., Fagnan's edition of his works reviewed, 263.

Lightfoot, Bishop, his edition of the writings of SS. Ignatius and Polycarp reviewed, 100.

Lintner, J. A., his report on injurious and other insects reviewed, 353.

M

MacLennan, J. F., his memoir of Thomas Drummond reviewed, 447.

Mazade, Ch. de, his edition of the correspondence of Marshal Davout reviewed, 199.

Memnon, the Voice of, review of works by M. Fagnan, Sir Gardner Wilkinson, and others, 263—the colossi of Thebes, 264—inscriptions on them, 265—the Vocal Memnon, 266—who was Memnon? 268—first mention of the statue's vocal powers, 269—last record of the phenomenon, 271—nature of the sound, 272—attributed by Sir G. Wilkinson to priestly deception, 274—probably due to natural causes, 280—similar instances of sonorous rocks, 281—various hypotheses on the physical origin of the sound, 281.

Michaelis, A., his work on Ancient Marbles reviewed, 484.

Mommsen, T., his 'Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum' reviewed, 263.

Mulhall, M. G., his work on the History of Prices reviewed, 1.

Müntz, Eugène, his History of Tapestry reviewed, 137.

N

Needlework, Art, review of works by Lady Marion Alford and other writers on, 137—earliest forms of embroidery, 139—textile honours of the dead, 143—decorative needlework among the Israelites, 144—celestial and geographical designs, 144—relations of needlework to other arts, 148—Homer unfamiliar with needlework, 152—Roman embroidery, 154—Byzantine art, 155—early Church embroidery, 157—famous embroideresses, 158—the Bayeux tapestry, 159—early excellence of English, 160—Moorish and Persian influences on, 162—decadence in English, 163.

Nelson, Horatio Viscount, his letters and despatches reviewed, 542—his seamanship, 549—qualities as a naval commander, 552—popularity with his subordinates, 557—regard for his superiors, 559—tactics, 563—inflexibility and tenacity, 569—contemporary estimation of, 572.

O

- Ormerod, Eleanor A.*, review of her works on Injurious Insects, 353.
Overbeck, J., his *History of Greek Plastic Art* reviewed, 484.

P

- Payne, John*, his translation of the 'Arabian Nights' reviewed, 166.
Prestwich, J., his work on Geology reviewed, 219.

R

- Romilly, H. H.*, his work on the Western Pacific reviewed, 73.
Ronchaud, Louis de, his work on Ancient Tapestry reviewed, 137. ‡

S

- Semper, Dr.*, his work on the Technical and Tectonic Arts reviewed 137.
Sculpture, Greek, review of works by Professor Michaelis and others upon, 484—the 'golden' and 'silver' periods of Greek Art, 485—standard of dimensions in ancient statues, 488—'chryselephantine' statuary, 488—interesting retrievals and identifications, 489—acquisitions during the early Stuart period, 496—sale of collections under the Long Parliament, 501—Arundel collection, 501—Dilettanti Society, 503—Elgin Marbles, 507—British Museum, 509.
Shelley, Percy Bysshe, review of Mr. Buxton Forman's edition of his works, 42—his poetry, 43—his prose, 45—his novels, 46—his theories, 48—influence of Godwin upon, 50—Shelley's Irish campaign, 53—his hatred of violence, 54—his opinion on universal suffrage, 56—his views on marriage and on love, 57—his attitude towards religion, 60—his Platonism, 65—Shelley as a critic and a letter-writer, 68—estimate of his genius, 71.

T

- Trade and the Means of Exchange*, 1—canal and steam navigation, 2—railways, 3—Thames Tunnel and 'Great Eastern,' 4—'Railway Mania,' 5—railways and social habits, 6—overland route to India, 7—railways in India, 8—interoceanic railways and canals, 9—Alpine tunnels, 10—projected ship canals, 11—electric telegraph, 12, 15—increase of steamships, 12—railways and cost of land carriage, 14—effects of improved conveyance on trade, 19—money, as a means of exchange, 26—Californian and Australian gold, 30—recent monetary dearth, 36—depression of trade, 37.
Tromholt, Sophus, his work on the Aurora Borealis reviewed, 416.

U

- University for London*, a new teaching body projected, 241—Lord Brougham's scheme, 241—the present University an examining body, 244—desire for a teaching university, 246—Lord Reay's scheme, 250—classics in the curriculum, 252—French and German

ideas of university education, 254—cost of a university course, 256
—Government aid, 257—endowments necessary, 258.

V

Véron, Eugène, his work on the Franco-German war reviewed, 301.

W

Waldstein, Charles, his essays on the Art of Pheidias reviewed, 484.

Walpole, Spencer, his History of England reviewed, 513.

Western Pacific, review of works by Baron Hübner and Mr. Romilly concerning the, 73—definition of the term 'Western Pacific,' 78—sandal-wood trade, 79—British naval commanders in, 80—the 'old labour trade,' 81—the High Commissioner, 82—French and German trade competition in, 84—a trader's station, 86—cotton-growing, 86—the Germans in Samoa, 87—demand for labour, 88—Fiji, 89—need of international agreement in support of law, 92—Norfolk Island and New Guinea, 94—missionaries in, 94—interest of our colonies in, 98—international convention, 99.

Wilkinson, Sir Gardner, his work on Modern Egypt reviewed, 263.

Willis, Prof. Robert, his work on the Architectural History of Cambridge reviewed, 382.

Y

Young, Arthur, his Tour in Ireland reviewed, 447.

END OF VOL. CLXIV.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

HDI



HW 3MV1 F

This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

~~OCT 18 1935~~



DNof 12/22/96

